

**THE FALSIFICATION OF
THE HISTORY OF
PRIMEVAL CHRISTIANITY**

by Wilhelm Kammeier

From the late author's estate, edited and published by Roland Bohlinger

Verlag für ganzheitliche Forschung

(ISBN 3-922314-03-1)

Translated from the 2nd edition, '2001', as found online (public domain), by Friedrich August
Wilhelm Erxleben d.J.

Published online on archive.org with the kind permission of the **Bohlinger Verlagsgruppe**

Table of contents

Cover text from the original '2001' book	5
Preface by your 'Translator'	7
Preface by Roland Bohlinger	9
Reminder from the past	10
Book 1: The handwritten tradition o/t New Testament	
Introduction: The significance of historicity in Christianity	12
I. The problem of time in the evolutionary history of Christianity	18
II. Sensation over a falsified papyrus	27
III. Two chief errors o/t papyrological science	35
IV. Caution! Artificial facts and artificial problems	43
V. A papyrological dilemma and its consequences	51
VI. Secrets around the antique parchment codices	65
VII. Five venerable majuscule 'Methuselahs'	75
VIII. Show pieces of chance	85
IX. The mystery o/t new-testamentarian text variants	92
X. The biblical text's fear of uniqueness	101
XI. The uniform origin o/t text families	114
XII. The text mixture o/t newly discovered papyri	128
Book 2: The oral gospel	
Introduction	142
I. Naïve pseudo-proofs for the historicity of Jesus	143
II. Miscellaneous on the alleged events and the primeval community's humans	155
III. Oral tradition and community legend	167
IV. The epidemic memory weakness o/t primeval Christians	180

V. Religious-psychologically, was the alleged formation of a primevally christian church even possible?	203
--	------------

VI. The central problem o/t christian primeval history	214
---	------------

Book 3: The struggle for a historical core in the gospels

Introduction	244
---------------------	------------

Bridge: The synoptical question and its solutions so far	245
---	------------

I. Evangelist psychology	257
---------------------------------	------------

II. An intermediate act: John and the synoptists	268
---	------------

III. More on the critique o/t two-sources theory	276
---	------------

IV. A synoptical double-mill	288
-------------------------------------	------------

V. The indefensibility o/t layers hypothesis'	298
--	------------

VI. Figments of imagination as gospel writers	315
--	------------

VII. A textbook example of how to construct layers	329
---	------------

VIII. Defeat o/t layer separators in the struggle for a historic core in the overall gospel	337
--	------------

Book 4: The uniform origin of all gospels

Introduction	351
---------------------	------------

I. A researcher of variants in search for the "original" text	352
--	------------

II. Dynamic or static character o/t overall gospels?	362
---	------------

III. The deliberate contradiction in the gospels as testimony to their uniform origin	383
--	------------

IV. Why the forgers' association had to utilise the tactics o/t deliberate contradiction	396
---	------------

V. The mystery o/t gospels as a literary genre	408
---	------------

VI. Blueprint and action mechanism o/t dramatic Jesus narrative	419
--	------------

VII. The overall gospel as the Certificate of Appointment to the clergy	432
--	------------

Literature Index	453
-------------------------	------------

Cover text from the original '2001' book

In his book *1984*, George Orwell describes how the ones in power completely falsify the presentation of history. New insights, new errors and new judgements about the past are an everyday occurrence, but so are flawed knowledge, silencing, forgetting and falsifying. Large-scale falsification undertakings are not an everyday occurrence however, the way we have experienced them in the USSR after 1917, and with ourselves after 1945. Even a *complete* falsification of the past, as Orwell describes it, had already taken place once before, that is, in the late Middle Ages. Kammeier has intensely concerned himself with this.

Kammeier is the classic among the discoverers of history falsifications. The results of his investigations can only be described as revolutionary, but also devastating. In the meantime, the established historical science – i.e. the science that strives to be "politically correct" – no longer contests that the documents, upon which our written history on the German and European early times and the Middle Ages is founded, are to a considerable proportion forgeries; what still is contested is the magnitude of that proportion – a fact blanked by most history teachers.

According to Kammeier, the largest part of the documents from those times is forged, and it is his merit having convincingly proven this. He has also managed, for the first time, to produce a conclusive and equally intelligible explanation for the flood of forgeries.

The presented volume is the third and last volume of the publication of Kammeier's extensive investigations. It contains a temporarily lost manuscript by the researcher, who starved to death in the GDR in 1959. In it, Kammeier examines the question, whether the documents on

the history of Christianity's foundation are authentic. He comes to the conclusion that the previously presented documents, one and all, are forgeries. The in the 19th and 20th century found parchment and papyrus fragments of gospels are by him also recognised as forgeries. Thus however, for the author, the beginnings of Christianity and the christian church remain largely in the dark.

Preface by your 'Translator'

Warning: the implications of this here work, all the more in connection with *Kammeier's* previous volumes on the falsification of pan-European/medieval history, can offhand knock out the strongest man/woman. Unless you are lucky enough to be capable of dumping just about *everything* you ever thought you'd 'learned' in schools, in the papers, on TV etc., you may well end up in an asylum of sorts. This is not meant to be a laughing matter.

Prepare yourself.

(Now, sensing that the title alone has the power... If this ever hits the mainstream... ... which it never will of course, unless perhaps each and every one of you gives not a hoot, but rather a permanent symphonic mega concert of **HOOTs** at the top of your voice, ideally amplified.)

Somebody 'online' once said something about wanting to check whether this work's literary style is in line with that of *Kammeier's* previous works, presumably because as opposed to his previous works, this here volume was first published by the late German editor/publisher *Roland Bohlinger* as late as around '1990', i.e. 30+ years after *Kammeier's* death. The short answer: yes, it is in line.

The longer one: I'd give my right arm for *R Bohlinger's* personal integrity as an editor/publisher (also for that of *Kammeier* as a writer, for that matter), and these large-as-life heroes should have monuments erected to their honour and memory, at least in their home places, just for researching/writing/editing/publishing this here work alone.

One inescapable conclusion (of many!) of this work (as well as many others!) is that all of us humans are lumbered with this smelly, rotten bogus timeline according to which *we* from the North and West (Atlantis) have known the 'bliss' of 'civilisation' only for some poxy 2000 or so years; (but hit me if *I* know what our actual year *should* be, probably a 5-digit number of this or that age). In case you may be wondering, that is the reason for me putting year numerals in apostrophes (e.g. '1950's) in those portions of text that aren't part of the translation. Naturally, the year numerals of the actual text remained untouched/unchanged.

If you don't like bandworm sentences – tough on you (and on me, for that matter)! The worst about it is at the same time the best about it: you will have to (I had to) read them

more than once (worst), but thus reinforcing what's been read (best), helping to understand the matter at hand just a little better.

By the way, I'd rather be dead than caught using , of all things, so-called 'artificial intelligence' (a contradiction in terms of the worst kind, also by the way) for translation – yrch!

However, as the apostrophes in the title suggest, I do not rate myself a proper translator anyway. Most of native English speakers will probably have a word or two to say about my use of the English language, especially sentence structure, or commas (with which I am in a state of war) for example, or blunders such as 'copist' instead of 'copyist' (no excuse for this one, I was probably several miles up in the air with my 'thoughts' when that happened) in the previous volumes.

Else, almost the same procedure as with the two previous volumes: On this occasion, *Kammeier* had monopolised both endnotes (1, 2, 3...) *and* footnotes (*). The latter had to be inserted in the running text so that yours truly was still able to use footnotes (I, II, III...) for more tuppences. Square brackets [...] are also edited by yours truly, except those with a "K." at the end of the entry, when *Kammeier* did what I'm doing with them.

Well then, I wish you a happy using-your-own-heads :)

Perhaps we as mankind can one day overcome the superstition we had allowed to be snuck in on us by this bible bunk, among others. (We as mankind have, by and large, been turned from a *knowing* into a *believing* species, after all. Hi Seth aka White Power, wherever you are.)

But a man can dream, right?

And finally: share this, discuss it, blog it, post it, edit it, translate it, smoke it – do with it what you like. I did/do what I had/have to do, and my reward was/is – doing it.

Friedrich August Wilhelm Erxleben d.J.

Swindon, England, '2024/25'

Preface by Roland Bohlinger

With this, the publisher presents the third and last volume of the edition of the works of *Wilhelm Kammeier*. This volume is a previously unpublished work, which originated between 1942-56 and was deemed lost. With this, *Wilhelm Kammeier* had re-worked and massively expanded a work with the same title released in 1942.

Now as before, *Kammeier's* work is being silenced to death, by the world of experts as much as by the christian churches. It is too big a stone of contention.

In his book *1984*, *George Orwell* describes how "big brother", after "seizing power", had ordered the entire historical tradition to be re-written. This novelesk description has a historical predecessor: the events around the falsification of the pre-medieval tradition by the Roman curia.

The honourability and quality of the nowadays and future history research will have to have itself appraised by, among others, how well it acknowledges *Kammeier's* findings.

Roland Bohlinger

Of three thousand years account
Those who lack the means to give
Stay inexperienced – in darkness bound
Only day by day may live*

*A German freemason wrote this around 200 or so years ago; this is my best attempt of a translation; and because he was a freemason for over 50 years of his life, I would not normally quote or even mention him, but he is of course quite right in what he wrote on that occasion, when he was sharing this seemingly insipid titbit (if you don't know your history, you know nothing at all! It's the dark ages for you!) with us profanes.

Book 1

The handwritten tradition of the New Testament

Introduction

The significance of historicity in Christianity

In its fundamental statements, Christianity, the way it is proclaimed in the New Testament (NT), is *history*, that is, history of both revelation and salvation. Namely the wonderful story of the son of God, incarnated in the shape of the human being Jesus. According to biblical perception, two chains of events are to be distinguished with this salvation story: the natural-worldly and the superworldly-divine, which do not take turns with each other however, but which unfold parallel from the beginning. The worldly happenings take shape in the natural birth and the natural death of a real human being (Jesus), the supernatural ongoing consist of the incarnation of a divine being (Christ). In the shape of Jesus Christ, inasmuch and for as long as the latter dwelled on Earth, both chains of events are most intensely and inextricably entangled with each other: they form a unit, and they cannot be separated without destroying the facts as a whole. It cannot at all be overlooked what extraordinary significance is thus attributed to the *worldly-natural factors* in the overall complex of the salvation narrative.

Christianity wants to be more than just the codification of ethical-moral commands. Besides a God-pleasing lifestyle, the christian religion also demands of its confessors something very significant, something very peculiar: the firm belief in certain extraordinary *historical events*. These salvation events are handed down and testified to by the historical books of the NT (the gospels and the acts). Ultimately, only by unconditional belief in the once by Jesus effected historical *salvation facts* can a Christian attain bliss.

Thus, the christian religion owes, in a much deeper sense than for example Islam or Buddhism do, its temporal origin and its innermost nature to a complex of historical facts. What Jesus *had proclaimed* to be a Christian's life norm – the word – is well important, but

infinitely more important are the *historical facts* which supposedly occurred as stepping stones of Christ's career, primarily his birth, his voluntary sacrificial death and his resurrection. If things with this extraordinary human being from Nazareth are in fact as they are handed down, then Christianity may indeed boast of possessing the safest kind of an objective foundation of faith. If the revelation history is true! If it is *true and has really happened in its worldly-natural progress of events as well!* This condition must be met under any circumstance. It may still be acceptable if the tradition of the natural progress may turn out to be dubious or even false in some minor points, *one* historical fact must stand as a rock: that Jesus once really lived at the given time in Palestine!

We do not leave mother's womb sceptically; with regards to a historical tradition, too – especially when it tells of heroic and courageous deeds – there is the human tendency to first of all place trust in the authenticity and truthfulness of the story. We are raised to become a sceptic – both fortunately and unfortunately – by terrible experiences having painfully brought to our consciousness the omnipresence of falsifications and lies in the realm of history as well. Then, scepticism becomes a protective weapon for our long abused truthfulness. Wherever there is history in form of written tradition existing and posing for truth, experience urges us to generally be sceptical, and to call for the history critic.

In the following investigations, it cannot be our task as historians to criticize the ethical commands or the christian religion's secrets of faith; *there will be professing historical critique only*, critique of Christianity's handed down formation history. Of course, since Christianity's formation, too, supposedly consists of real historical facts, the "historical fact of the revelation" can and must neither be considered untouchable to critique nor have access withdrawn from the history researcher. By the way, even many theological critics have admitted to this for a long time; why, it deserves to be mentioned that the first forceful moves

in the way of scrutinizing the gospels as Christianity's foundation documents came from the side of truth-seeking protestant theologians.*

*A history critic must be prepared to be told off, namely when the results of his research turn out negative, when love of truth and rocksteady consequence of thinking force him to admit that in the case at hand, the tradition is deceitful and unauthentic. However, we should not turn things upside down. If in so many cases, the researcher's work produces a negative result, the fault does not lie with the researcher, but with the object of the critique, with the deceitful historical source. This is also the reason why the history researcher has to be protected against the accusation that from sheer scepticism, his goal be merely to reveal, to tear down and to destroy in order to stand before nothingness, and to thus enjoy the space emptied of history. Why, is truth always nothing as soon as it amounts to the found realisation that a handed down fact in question turns out to be false? The conscientious history researcher, stepping up to his task, will not plan for anything nor strive for anything but to exploring the truth. And always and everywhere, the truth needs defendants, for only rarely can an inconvenient truth win by its own strength. Not striving for truth, not the sense of truthfulness either, but admitting to the truth has always been a rare virtue.

We scrutinize Christianity's formation only inasmuch as worldly historical events have supposedly featured. Throughout centuries, christian theologians have been boasting that, as a massive advantage and soothing comfort, their religion be so tightly connected with the history of Jesus of Nazareth, and thus be resting on a foundation of objective events.

Historical facts are something objective and secure, naturally; unfortunately however, we only know Christianity's formation history in a quality of the tradition that is by no means designed in a way that it may be believed without reservations. This statement of insecurity of all new-testamentarian tradition is no longer denied by any scientifically researching theologian. What's more is, that if a historical source allows for any growing doubt with regards to the character of its authenticity in the first place, it then looks rather gloomy for its

use as a foundation for a mental construct. What has previously been perceived as a comfort, turns then out to be an ever growing burden and bother.

Christianity's religion system has always had to withstand strong attacks that had been presented by the philosophical and the scientific side. The situation has changed however: nowadays, philosophical and scientific critique barely intimidate the defendants. Clever theologians are very well capable of parrying such attacks with more or less luck. All the more shocking and depressing is the one criticism against Christianity's historical foundation raised by history researchers. When once upon a time, hearty theologians began professing *historical* gospel critique, they could not fathom upon what slippery slope they dared venture. Initially, critique on the tradition was needed and embraced as a welcome helper out of all sorts of dogmatic confusion, because the knife of historical bible critique proved most suitable in cutting off "*wild legend sprouts*" of the dogma tree. At first of course, only twigs and branches fell, but soon, the chopping became more and more serious, and one day, the weapon penetrated the heart of the trunk. One biographical "fact" after the other dropped from Jesus' story so that finally, the worried question turned up: what then is actually true after all? Is there anything true and real at all in the worldly story of the man from Nazareth and that of his followers and disciples?

Facing the abyss opening up before them, theologians now indeed began to fight back and warn: Halt! One mustn't go that far. Such questions and doubts are absurd. This is hypercritique. Christianity must yet have a starter and founder, and that can be none other than Jesus of Nazareth. Although we must admit, the theologians say, that it is not possible to draw up a real life story of the founder based upon the contradictory new-testamentarian sources, this deficiency is actually not all that bad, because in his speeches, we yet possess the most authentic testimony to the unique character of his nature after all, and thus also the best proof for the historicity of this preacher.

Let us not have our time wasted by seriously appraising the above argumentation – it is limping on both legs; it lacks logic as well as any sense of reality at all.

It is admirable how quickly and easily some theologians can accept the massive attacks on the credibility of the new-testamentarian reports nowadays. To the faithful, they simply declare the entire worldly series of facts of the salvation history principally meaningless. So does *Fr. Buri*, who in doing so, positions himself on the "*philosophical plane of existence*": "*Salvation does not hang from one point in history. Inasmuch as the new testament says so, to us, it is no longer graspable mythological speech... We no longer need to be worried now that through historical research, something irreplaceable could be taken from us, and for that reason, we no longer need to quite so desperately, consciously or subconsciously, openly or covertly, evade or bend their methods and results.*"¹ With these statements, solely the frankness of the admission is remarkable.

E. Dinkler also admits that the Jesus story is not to be viewed as a historically factual report, because the biblical Jesus picture had been painted by the faith of the community, why, that "*oftentimes the faith had created the story that is meant to prove it.*" If he then declares "*that the truth of the christian faith is in no way attached to the accuracy of the historical picture, but solely in whether or not it is really founded upon the story which in this picture, he is drawing up in a peculiar design*", another theologian (*W Wiesner*) comments on that: "*If, in the story of Jesus Christ, God's deed is the foundation and the subject of christian belief, then he is infinitely interested in the accuracy of the historical picture inasmuch as it concerns this story, and his truth depends on it. How can the belief be tied to a historic event of which he perhaps has an entirely wrong idea?*"²

Away from the story around Jesus, inasmuch as it is a myth! The most well-known representative of this claim is theologian *R Bultmann*. He presented his program of a radical

de-mythologising of the new-testamentarian Jesus image in a treatise *On New Testament and Mythology*. According to him, the tradition of Jesus as God's son, among others, of his deeds of deliverance in his death on the cross, in his resurrection and ascension, is not history, but mythological speech.³ "*The Easter event as the resurrection of Christ is not a historical event.*" "*The christian belief is not interested in the question of history.*" The only historical thing about Easter is Christ's "*apparition*" in the disciples' visionary experiences. *Bultmann* strongly diminishes the Jesus image, he stands bravely *against* the myth; but then, something strange happens: *Bultmann* drops the "historical Jesus" as the basis of the christian belief, but he retains the myth! Because for the christian belief, the mythological elements are exquisitely suited, when refined into the purely spiritual and, as "Christology", liberated from the bonds of history. Instead of the historically insecure Jesus of Nazareth, we get a, by "conviction" secured, pneumatic *Christus praesens*.

Thus, factually, a Christianity without Jesus is proclaimed. Together with *Bultmann*, other theologians as well are prepared to detach the in those myths personified christological ideas from Jesus of Nazareth, and to fill them with new meaning. In this new view of faith, the "resurrection of Christ" for example has a fundamentally different meaning from the fleshly re-awakening of the person Jesus. "History" cannot be suspended more energetically than is done here by theologians. Today, it is wholesomely declared that the previously so daunting question whether Jesus has lived at all has been rendered irrelevant, meaningless, through and for the pneumatic kind of view of the "salvation facts". However, theology cannot quite so simply and easily circumnavigate the "Jesus story". We are permitted to "overlook" "history" only once it has been refuted historically-critically. And more than anything, it must not be ignored that not only the Jesus story, but also the history of the disciples as well as the christian primeval history per se are a historically dubious affair.

How far the conscientious researcher is allowed to go, how far he must go in his critique of the tradition, he cannot permit being told, but only own insight into the problem as such and into the quality of the sources of the tradition can decide on that. Thus, it must not be tolerated in any case that the central problem of all biblical research – the question of the historicity of the person Jesus – is bricked up and fenced off as a danger zone; it is much rather time to finally open up the problem to research in all its width and depth. We submit ourselves to this task; not however, in order to walk the hundredfold walked paths of critique once more; not to once more perform work in vain, with the obsolete tools of relativistic pseudo-critique; but in order to deal with, and ultimately guide the question of the historicity of Jesus as well as that of primeval Christianity per se under entirely new viewpoints, and with a new method of critique.

I. The problem of time in Christianity's evolutionary history

To the christian soul, any critique of the gospels, but especially the historical critique of the new-testamentarian documents will mean a sacrilege. Their brave deed, as a testimony to their truthfulness, has to be rated highly in favour of those theologians who, despite this, have taken on the risk of criticism. *P Wernle* has considered it necessary to equally apologise for the unsettling results of the research of gospel critique. "*Our gospel critique is very unedifying and nuisance-generating. We, who conduct it, perceive this ourselves with piercing sharpness. To most of us, the bible has once been the holy, untouchable book, until critique has destroyed that belief. We therefore understand the pain that it causes, and the anger that it generates... However, there is no way out at all for us to escape this duty to criticism.*" And now, in the following words, *Wernle* hits the nail on the head: "*The un-*

*edification lies in the matter itself, in the design of the book that the religion has given to us. He who wants to scold this may scold God himself, who has given to us the bible just the way it is... as Christianity's weakest point of attack."*⁴

Much contempt and a plentiful measure of insults is what liberal theological critics have been awarded by their orthodox co-Christians. While we may recognise from the above "apology", that theology critique had already placed their outer barriers rather broadly, even the bravest representatives among this group – besides rare exceptions – have shied at the last consequence of their thinking.

The really consequent critics of the new-testamentarian tradition material have experienced much more terrible things than they were forced to proclaim for the sake of their truthfulness: Christianity's historical foundation is not only unreliable in occasional parts, but it is rotten through and through, and in reality, Jesus of Nazareth is no historical personality, but a figure of fiction. The proclaimers of this negative general result are insulted and treated as if they had turned into criminals against the most holy not only by the strongly devout theologians, but also by the liberal ones.

*Arthur Drews once (1928) bitterly complained: "Currently, the situation is that he who represents theology's viewpoint is offhand an "excellent scholar", and can expect every and any support, while on the other hand, deniers of the historical Jesus, one and all, are considered unworthy "dilettantes"; with regards to science, they are outlaws and have to consider themselves lucky, if they are not fancied to have their scientific honour slandered, and to be portrayed as cranks whose... omissions are not worthy of any serious attention."*¹

And then, *Drews* still references some words of the consequent critic *Van den Bergh van*

Eysinga: "*In the scientific world, one can only live peacefully*", so the latter said, "*if one at*

I If this doesn't sound familiar, what with the "deniers" and their treatment by the usual suspects and all. I just say "holocaust deniers"... It's just another one of those large-as-life 'patterns'. You look and listen enough, and you'll find this sort (and others, of course) again and again.

*least leaves a minimum of historicity to the evangelical history", that is, if one at least acknowledges the naked fact of the historicity of Jesus.⁵ All the more, it should be acknowledged that occasionally, even in theological circles, voices can be heard who speak not only for the entitlement to, but the necessity for a consequent gospel critique. We reference H Windisch who commented on this as follows: "The radical myth of Christ is no idiosyncrasy. It is a necessary product of the research in religion and myths as well as the ever progressing gospel critique of pre-war times. It is founded upon perceptions which are both important and touching on fundamentals. It is very much a working hypothesis, and a fringe option for all of theology. For this, i.e. for posing relevant problems to us, our thanks should not be withheld from them [the radical gospel critics; K.]."*⁶

The officially permitted gospel critique can take away from the story of Jesus' life as much as it wants, just so long as it only leaves the historicity as such untouched. Why, on the side of theology, it is now flatly admitted that there is much unhistorical contained in the gospels; within the primevally christian community, the true story of its founder had been decorated, i.e. falsified, with all sorts of legends very soon after Jesus' death. The mass of legends was heaped ever higher onto the "factual events", so that eventually, the historical core disappeared completely under the rubble. But the true core still exists, theologians reassure us; and in order to place the true story in the daylight once more, we would only need to remove the legendary layers of rubble. We will thoroughly get busy on this so plausible sounding theory of core-and-rubble later. Because especially since the release of *Myth of Christ* by Drews, who denies Jesus' historicity, both theologians and non-theologians set out to cleanse the "real core" from the so-called community legend. Just note already: all attempts at digging up the pure primeval stone of the Jesus story have failed.*

*We will dedicate the entire Part 3 of this research series to the investigation and the statement, that, and why, a historical core in the overall gospels can never be found.

As much as I am in agreement with *Arthur Drews* in the overall result of his critique – that Jesus is not a figure of history – this does not free me from the duty to confront a consequent thinker critically and without reservations, either. Wherever there are deficiencies and errors to be perceived in the line of evidence, they have to be revealed. Even *Arthur Drews* and *Bruno Bauer* are not correct in all their claims. These critics have overlooked important problems, misjudged their significance, and more than anything, solved them wrongly.**

**Let us not be unjust however; it has to be credited to these men that they worked with a methodical tool, whose blade left a lot to desire in terms of critical sharpness. They had to still handle the old, notchy "relative" method. Only once the new "absolute" method of historical critique had been invented, ultimate results regarding christian primeval history could be achieved, too.

In the following, I want to show that so far, all consequent critics have also erred in one of the most important points in the Jesus'-life-problem. Namely, with the by them proclaimed historicity of the founder, the *mystery of Christianity's formation* becomes a gigantic one. *How* and predominantly *when* was Christianity supposed to have formed without Jesus? Both *Drews* as well as *Bauer*, besides others, have stumbled over the *problem of time*. Christianity has exceedingly skilfully managed to hide time and circumstances of its true birth.

Truly given to us, as products in writing on the origin of the christian religion, are the gospels and the acts. With this, there is objective material for investigation as a starting point for the critique. To get to the bottom of Christianity's formation thus means to first of all clarify the origin of the new-testamentarian "historical" scripts. According to *Arthur Drews* and *Bruno Bauer*, the time of origin

of the in the gospels historicised^{II} Christ legend dates around the *middle of the 2nd century*. Drews himself has clearly sensed the problem of this temporal placement, because such early a formation date poses insurmountable "practical" difficulties, which he tries to eliminate in vain. Nonetheless, he asserts: "*But the thus available timespan was fully sufficient to pass an invented personality off as historical, who was meant to have died around the year 30 of the first century, without having to worry that the true character of this personality could have been challenged with historical arguments.*"⁷

As we can see, this is about the following "practical" difficulty: just exactly how was it possible that around the year 150, some religious group of sectarians – in Jerusalem or Rome – got away unchallenged with a *totally made up* Jesus story in the midst of suspicious *contemporaries* who had a hostile attitude towards them? Just how was it possible that all the world around the year 150 promptly fell for the obvious swindle presented to them? We are just to critically imagine this situation in practice! The gospel fictionists have not perhaps delivered a carefully thought up work of narration and passed it off as history; looking from the "historical" side, the gospel novel represents an unrivalled concoction of clumsiness. Even Drews has to admit this: "*All researchers are in agreement on how carefreely the sectarians have handled real history, and how little interest they had creating conformity to the real events that could just about hold water in case of a potential investigation.*"⁸ Is this not recklessness unheard of? With such pitiful bungling work, the sectarians light-heartedly stepped before their wondering audience, before their enemies, and – found believing souls all around! Remarkable, most remarkable.

II Here we go again: this one is not in my dictionary – 'historicise' of course is to 'history' what 'poeticise' is to 'poetry'. It's meant to be, at any rate.

Psychologically, the affair pans out ever more mysterious. Let us at first have a look at the sectarians fictionalising their history novel. According to their plans, they *must* have been intent on the greatest possible conformity regarding the "historical" portions of their fiction and the temporally so close real past, if they themselves did not want to recklessly jeopardize the success of their wondrous efforts a priori. And indeed, these fictionists were – as can be seen from the purely religious portions of their work – no dumbheads. Thus, since they were no dumbheads, they had to be by all means guided by the *intent* and the *good will* to strive for the greatest possible conformity with the real history from 100 years before. But what do we hear? Carefree, like little children, unconcerned, like folks who have no interest in any success of their actions, they handle historical dates and things, and play with them. They are cordially unconcerned about conformity of their fantasies with the former real Jewish history. A priori, they are not intent on creating conformity at all. Peculiar! And now, we view the affair from the viewpoint of the audience as well, who was meant to be blessed with such bungling work as real history. And what do you know: these people, too, appear to have exclusively consisted of gullible children, because they have accepted the "historical" gift – this botched work – without reservations. Everybody – even the embittered enemies of the Christians! – found the "history", also with regards to details of places and names, in the best of order and in accordance with the "truth". We are to note well, what is at the heart of the affair: this is not predominantly about the many amazing miracle deeds attributed to Jesus, but it was about the risk, we must rather say: the incredible nerve to suddenly dish up to the unwitting contemporaries the story of a human being who had never lived, but was the monstrous product of imagination.

Not *one* soul got wise to the enormous swindle. Most remarkable. Or, let us at last say it frankly: impossible!

Drews, who is, as a matter of fact, just unable to date Christianity's formation any later than approximately the middle of the 2nd century, massively underrates the difficulties, namely the factors of the rough reality when he declares: "*It lies in a complete misconception of antiquity's religious way of thinking, and especially the oriental spirit to reckon that the Christ believers would have been guided by real historical facts with regards to the presentation of Jesus 'history', and that they would have to keep an eye on it, and that their opponents could have compared the veracity of their reports with historical tradition, and that they could have thus proven the fictional nature of the Jesus story.*"⁹ In practice however, the affair does not appear quite like this after all, and *Drews* theorises flat into empty space. Consider this: it is just this "fact" of the historicity of Jesus that was meant to be the convincing and advertising moment of the new religion promoted by the sectarians. Their excellent religious news is based upon "real" history, or so they boasted. In their series of novels, they had the evangelist Luke himself amply point this out! In other words: they themselves practically asked for scrutinisation of the "historical" details of their Jesus fiction. And previously in this, the men, as playful children, supposedly did not place the least value on an even roughly accurate conformity with the real tradition? Only utter dumbheads could have acted in this way, but truly, the gospel writers were not that.

More than anything, neither was the Jewish people a congregation of dumbheads. Even *Drews* himself highlights further that when one allegedly turned up with the "historical" Jesus around the year 150, the novelty was everywhere confronted "*with resistance in the people.*" "*Even own brothers and parents*" wanted

"to know nothing of the... Messiah."¹⁰ So there, the Jesus inventors encountered a phalanx of the toughest opponents and suspicious enemies. And these opponents around the year 150 were – the *grand-children* of the contemporaries of the allegedly historical Jesus! *And none* of these grand-children had ever heard so much as one little word by their parents or grand-parents about Jesus' wonderful story, that had taken place 100 years earlier in broadest public.

Back then, they did not have to dig up files in order to prove the clumsiness of the fictional Jesus, they had to simply ask father and grand-father whether this "story" had really happened. And parents and grand-parents knew nothing, purely nothing at all of such amazing ongoingings. Nonetheless, *Drews* reckons, all the world without exception fell for the incredibly clumsy swindling manoeuvre. However, there are more impossibilities surfacing. On the one hand, Jesus supposedly died around the year 30, but on the other, his alleged *disciples* should have yet lived a little longer, and should have preached about the Messiah everywhere in the land. Like Jesus, so his "disciples", too, are now fictional figures according to the results of the consequent critics so far; but they, too, had to be passed off as real historical human beings. Let us just mull over what that means. In reality, these fictional disciples would have had to survive their master! Thus however – assuming Christianity's formation around the year 150 – the epoch of those fictionalised persons and events moves still *closer*; dangerously close to the, back then, present times. And that means: around the year 150, some *parents* of the opponents must have been *eyewitnesses* of the claimed public workings of the disciples and primeval apostles. But how strange: if they asked the *parents* for the fate of Jesus' disciples, again nobody has ever heard anything of them. Nonetheless, the plain fantasy story

of the sectarians was received by all readers and listeners with devout affirmation – reckons *Drews*.

Thus, we have arrived at the following final result: any attempt undertaken around the year 150, or perhaps even 200, at passing off fictional figures (Jesus and the apostles) who died only 50 or 100 years earlier, for historical ones, would have been invariably doomed to fail in no time at all as a result of the opponents' suspicion. This is what the forgers, as clever folks – regardless of whether they lived in Rome or Alexandria, in Palestine or Syria – would have told themselves, too. Thus, Christianity's formation *without* a historical Jesus as early as around the year 150 is just not on. The concept of the Jesus fiction, and with it, the formation of Christianity, *must* be placed *later, much later*.

Halt!, the theologists are shouting now, and not just theologists; and from the above argumentation, they now draw an entirely different conclusion. Because they conclude, and that apparently fully justified: if around the year 150, the gospel fictionists could not have possibly deceived their suspicious contemporaries with a clumsily invented Jesus figure, then the in the gospels reported story of the christian religion founder must be true, true at least in its coarse outline. Thus, Jesus of Nazareth and his disciples must have really lived and worked publically.

As has been said, this seemingly flawless conclusion experiences strong support from yet another side, from the side of archaeology. When Drews formulated his theory, he could not have guessed that a small papyrus fragment would suffice to knock out his temporal placement. *Graphology* stepped up against him. Up to then, the general findings of the preserved scripts had it well permitted to place the composition of the gospels, especially that of John as being the last one written,

around the middle of the 2nd century, since the most important codices supposedly originate from the 3rd and 4th century. However, the year 1935 brought a massive surprise. Just at the right time in Egypt, a lucky coincidence delivered an age-old papyrus to the light of day, on which some verses from chapter 18 of John's gospel were listed. *"Its publication in the year 1935 meant a sensation; because with it, all speculations wanting to place John's gospel around the year 150 or even later, had ultimately their life lights blown out."*¹¹ The sensation lay in the papyrus being written as early as *"around the year 125"*, as the experts proclaimed, that is, the writing-down has supposedly occurred *"without a doubt"* in Egypt. However, since John's gospel itself had *"certainly"* not been written in Egypt, but either in Asia Minor, or in Syria-Palestine, it must have taken several decades for it to be disseminated to Egypt. This ultimately means: our gospel of John originates, as is to be assumed, as early as around the year 90! So says the argumentation of the experts.

We recognise clearly: he who wants to profess critical gospel research, has to regard as their very first task to conduct an investigation into the handwritten tradition of the NT. Therefore, we will very thoroughly concern ourselves with the state of the new-testamentarian handwritings in the following chapters.

II. Sensation over a falsified papyrus

The at the end of the previous chapter mentioned papyrus – in the official list of Greek scripts of the NT, it carries the tag "P 52" – offers to us a welcome opportunity to immediately get to know one of the most important *problems of the handwritten*

tradition of the gospels. We have already heard of the sensation which the finding of this papyrus fragment had aroused, and also of the theologians' satisfaction over the fact that now at last, the troublesome question of the origin of the fourth gospel is ultimately settled. In P 52, proof exists that John's gospel has not, as previously mostly assumed, been authored as late as the year 150 or even later, but that its writing-down must have occurred as early as the year 90. The period of origin of the fourth gospel pre-dated by half a century and more – that was indeed a massive surprise.

For the deniers of Jesus' historicity, too, P 52 is of the utmost significance. At first glance of course, the papyrus seems to pose a major predicament to the deniers, and to blow the death knell to their "hypercritical" theory, because from the side of theology, we can now justifiably argue as follows: since the last written gospel of John, as proven by P 52, had been completed as early as the year 90, the preceding three synoptical gospels must have been authored soon after Jesus' death; this goes especially for the earliest, the gospel of Mark. Let us now imagine these things – so the theologians retort further – in the practice of the primeval Christians' life, then sound common sense tells us that around the year 50, it was quite impossible to spread among the people the fully made up "history" of a religion founder Jesus, who had supposedly died *only very recently*, if in reality, this founder had not even lived! Since such obvious fraud simply could not have gained momentum – because of course everybody was capable of refuting the obvious swindle – so, Jesus of Nazareth must well and truly be a figure of history.

Indeed, against the logic of this line of evidence, nothing can be objected to in the way of reason. Must the deniers of Jesus' historicity thus consider themselves defeated? Not yet; their theory would be disqualified under *one* condition only, and

the condition is this: it must be established that the gospels, at least by and large, report the *historical truth*.

Let us just assume as "already proven" that Jesus and his disciples are historical personalities. Now, what did the gospel authors aim at by their depiction of Jesus' life in their writings? They did not want to dump their documents in drawers, they wanted to make Jesus' recorded message known to all the people. The gospels were meant to recruit followers for the new religion by proclaiming the *truth* on Jesus' life and workings. As the composers themselves report, with their cause, they were facing a world of enemies, because their co-citizens, all the more the governing and influential circles of the population, proved to be embittered enemies of the new blasphemous religion. If they were to pacify or even win over such enemies, then they could not have dared present them such fat lies. *Not only* were the gospel writers *not* permitted to *invent in pomp and circumstance* a religion founder who allegedly died a few decades ago, they were also forced by the circumstances *to strictly stick to the truth with regards to the historical main details of Jesus' life* which were of course still widely known. That they attributed to the founder several uncontrollable miracle deeds made no real difference; but what had to unconditionally conform to the known facts was Jesus' "personal data" and those of his disciples. No unclarity whatsoever could be permitted over the "fact" for example, as to how many years Jesus' public activity took. Short and sweet: all arguments we have previously presented against the temporal placement of a *fully invented* Jesus story around the year 150, are now valid with an increased weight against the placement of a *coarsely falsified* history of the founder around the year 50. So shortly after Jesus' death, no evangelist would have seriously dreamt of sabotaging a priori the success of their

promotional work by falsifying or veiling well-known "facts" of Jesus' life story out of arbitrariness or fancy (!).

So, it is about the historical truth in the gospels. Again, how do theological critics judge their essential truth? We already know how their verdict turned out – namely devastating. When in Part 2 of this series of investigations, we concern ourselves in depth with the historical truth problem, we will come to the amazing conclusion that with regards to the details of Jesus' personal data, the greatest confusion is the rule. Even with the general geographical ideas of the gospel writers, it looks daunting. *H Conzelmann* has to admit about Luke: "*Such free-floating use of geographical details implies that the writer had no own recollection of Palestine; although he believes having it..., he obviously imagines Galilaea and Judaea to be adjacent to each other.*"¹²

We summarise what comes out when we, regarding the question of the formation time of the gospels, have things play out in the tough practice of real life of 'primeval Christians': neither can the gospels have been written around the year 150, nor around the year 50, they must originate from much later times. With this however, the deniers of the historical existence of a Jesus of Nazareth have taken the field of critique.

Not so, the theologists speak up immediately, and we is emphatically reminded of the existence of P 52, which, as is well known, delivers strict proof that even the last of the four gospels had been authored and disseminated in all of Christianity around 90. Does not this archaeological "fact" tear my entire, on inner (psychological) causes resting chain of evidence apart? Here, a question is being raised, which is of the utmost significance, because it concerns the nature of all

historical-archaeological critique, inasmuch as it is concerned with the authenticity of the tradition. Here, as much as in my previous writings on the *FALSIFICATION OF GERMAN HISTORY*^{III}, it is about the chief problem of all historical authenticity research: relative or absolute method of comparison?

Well now, P 52 is indubitably an objective thing, a papyrus fragment, and I would not hesitate rating this find very highly – if its authenticity were beyond question, if this were really a remainder from the mentioned early times. It is the papyrologists who claim that P 52 is authentic, and of course, they also present reasons for their claim. But just these papyrologists (and equally the historians in their capacity as authenticity critics of antique and medieval history sources) have of old excelled by the fact that of all scientists, they were the most harmless and most gullible ones. We will soon show this by several beautiful examples – which refer to biblical papyri. Time and again, the papyrologists fall for "artificial facts"; for one, because they utilise the relative method of comparison in a mechanical fashion, but primarily because they are principally prepared to view each new find unsuspectingly, instead of sceptically.

Before I set out to examine papyrology of the new-testamentarian realm of the tradition regarding their claim to scientism, let us as well pretend to be harmless, and until further notice, assume that P 52 is factually an object from the beginning of the 2nd century, and that thus, the origin of John's gospel really dates to the last decade of the 1st century. He who is not particularly familiar with the content of the 4th gospel, and who has not most thoroughly studied the peculiar relation in which John's gospel stands to the three other gospels cannot be blamed if they feel joy over the by P 52 "proven" very early originating period of this gospel. Naturally,

III Clearly misnamed; replace "German" with "pan-European". Kammeier has clearly shown it.

particularly the theologians rejoice; they only regret that the find had not occurred any earlier, since it, *"for the scientific discussion 60 years ago, would have been an invaluable asset."*¹³ On the other hand, I believe and hope to be permitted to say that there are also theological critics who view P 52 full of worry, and who are not at all edified by its existence. Because if we seriously consider the position of the 4th gospel towards the preceding three gospels, we must encounter all sorts of headaches over the temporal move into the 1st century.

Let us remember the results of our investigation so far regarding the time of origin of the new-testamentarian "historical" books. We have arrived at this conviction: life records with coarsely falsified – from arbitrariness or indifference – personal data of Jesus, the way Matthew, Mark and Luke offer them to us, could not have possibly been written one or two decades after the founder's death by "primeval Christians", nor be unreservedly accepted by their embittered enemies [let alone the believers...]. With the first three evangelists, we still find, viewed on the whole, at least an attempted approach in the biographical details – thus, Matthew, Mark and Luke are called the synoptists – but between John and the synoptists, there is an abyss opening up. Let us explicitly note that we are not interested in John's dogmatic and mythological extra opinions; we are merely concerned with the by the 4th evangelist reported life circumstances of Jesus. And there, it turns out that John, in utmost piece of mind, treats the biographical details of his predecessors like air; he breaks the by Matthew, Mark and Luke handed down framework of the narrative, and constructs a new one, which represents the counterpart. To name but one: according to the synoptists, Jesus lived and taught in Judaea; only shortly before the death passover, the master arrives in Judaea (Jerusalem) with the disciples. John knows it better however, because according to his depiction, Judaea was the actual

place of Jesus' messianic sphere of activity. What is more is, that according to the synoptists, we have to account for a duration of one year for Jesus' public appearances; but the fourth evangelist "improves" his three colleagues on this point as well, because according to his description, it can only be concluded that Jesus taught for at least two or even three years before he was crucified. This is not about some minor differences, but a fundamental contradiction at the heart of the story of the founder of the christian religion. Now, may the reader place themselves in the historical surroundings, in the last decade of the 1st century, when John allegedly blessed the christian communities with his spectacular gospel. Three gospels had supposedly already been in circulation for several decades, then suddenly, a new Jesus story appears, in which, regarding the personal details, fundamentals are simply being turned upside down. What in all the world could have effected the "primevally christian" author to defame his journalist predecessors as liars? Always assuming that Jesus is a historical personality, then in the year 90, there would have been enough people still alive who knew exactly where and for how long the rabbi from Nazareth had taught and worked; in the face of this circumstance, only a dumbhead or a fool could have devised and put into action a plan to construct a life description of Jesus that no longer acknowledged "reality". The author – or better: the authors – of the 4th gospel however, were neither fools nor dumbheads, they were much rather highly educated men (from much later times), whom we have to thank for this brilliant religious writing.

At this point, it is sufficient to merely make the problem of the relation between John and the synoptists just about visible; in one of the following parts, we will still concern ourselves with these things very thoroughly. But the reader will have realised that even theological bible critics, once they seriously mull the by

John's gospel conjured "primevally christian" situation over, will truly have no reason to rejoice over the discovery of P 52. Namely, the more the origin of the 4th gospel is being pre-dated, the harsher the monstrous arbitrary acts of this evangelist must be judged regarding Jesus' life details "known in all of Christianity". Let us just in all harmlessness assume, the first three gospels are "factually" primevally christian print products from the second half of the 1st century, then, perhaps (!) around 300, a Jesus story in the form of John's gospel may have had a tiny chance of trickling through into the communities. However, this would, for psychological reasons, be quite impossible in such early times immediately after the release of the synoptical gospels. It follows from this that P 52, which wants to convince us that around the year 125, the in the East originating gospel of John had already been disseminated in Egypt, represents a forgery. Against this appeal to sound common sense as the uppermost judge in this affair, against the heavyweight of the presented reasons, a papyrus fragment allegedly stemming from primevally old times – or even a fat papyrus or parchment codex – can do nothing about. Because forging a "primevally christian" papyrus is no big deal, but for psychological reasons, it is impossible that in the year 90, John's gospel, upsetting all the world, could have been written and disseminated in the described environment.

We now have to linger a little longer with the striking fact of the sharp *contradiction between John and the synoptists*, in order to immediately invalidate a objection so obvious, that every attentive reader will raise it. The objection is this: especially the discrepancies in the historical details testify to the authenticity of the gospels as primevally christian scripts; because: had these biblical books originated only in much later times as products of a universal falsification action, then certainly, within the forgery association, they would have agreed on Jesus' personal details in

order to avoid striking contradictions in the first place! I am reprimanded that the late medieval forgers were yet supposedly highly educated men – have they themselves not noticed then, how much their historical omissions contradict each other?

To this I reply: oh yes, the forgers have thought about the historical-topographical framework of the Jesus story for a very long time and very thoroughly; for decades, they have racked their brains on the founder's personal details that were to be used, and they have, over and over again, imagined the fictionalised personalities as acting in the "reality" of the Palestinian environment. Back then, just how much would they have loved to utilise uniqueness at least in the main details, but behold: to the great frustration of the forgery association, it turned out that with their Jesus novel, *unique details could not be made at all, and in no case were they even permitted to be made!* To some readers, such claim will sound illogical at first, but they may now themselves try to find out why the forgery association took the decision, e.g. with regards to the duration of Jesus' public workings, *to principally avoid unique details*. This problem, too, will be thoroughly dealt with in the following parts.

III. Two chief errors of the papyrological science

It is in connection with the in the opening chapter reviewed peculiarity of Christianity of being, by its salvation character, a *history religion*, that Christianity necessarily represents a religion of *tradition*, and thus a religion of *book(s)*. Secure knowledge of historical events can only be handed down by authentic written testimony. Very soon after its alleged formation,

Christianity as well – the news of the historical events constituting its nature has been put into writing in several books (gospels). We have heard that as early as the year 90, all four gospels existed in writing, and that they were immediately multiplied in the Christian communities. At first, *papyrus* served as writing material, then *parchment*, and only much later *paper*. Gospel handwritings on papyrus from primevally old times must therefore – if they are authentic – be considered particularly valuable.

Newly discovered old handwritings demand an examination and an assessment; certainty or at least likelihood has to be demanded on two points: *age and origin* (place of origin) of the script. This is achieved by utilisation of certain time-honoured rules of assessment that have been followed for centuries, and one and all of them aim at comparing the properties of a newly discovered codex (especially the material and the character of the writing) with already known handwritings that are considered authentic. Thus, the process of comparison is the main characteristic of this relativity method. What this, in circles moving pseudo-critical method is worth, we have just been taught by the P 52 case; and the readers of my writings on *The Falsification of German History* have had hundreds of opportunities to realise the utter uselessness of the comparison examination method on questions of authenticity. Ultimately, questions of authenticity can be decided upon only by the recourse to inner (psychological) causes, which has of course again been confirmed in the case of P 52.

How blunt and brittle the usual relative method is, and how dubious the results achieved by it are, can easily be recognised. Assuming there were "old" pieces of writing in existence – of papyrus or parchment – considered to be authentic: we now compare a newly discovered handwriting (or fragments thereof) regarding material and character of writing with the genuine pieces, and we establish equality or great resemblance, respectively – are we then, on the grounds of that diagnosis, entitled to declare the newly discovered script also

authentic? Our palaeographers, may they be dealing with papyrus or parchment, will barely hesitate viewing the authenticity as proven, although it is well-known to them that *skilled* forgers can with ease simulate a high age of the material, and copy the character of the writing! Sure, when forging bunglers set to work, the experts will soon be on to them. But there have always been forgers who were masters of their discipline, and against whose products the customary method of comparison is powerless. We know of course from manifold experience, what even individuals are capable of performing in terms of miracle-like forgeries, and we should really also know and take to heart the most important fact: that the falsification of "old historical" documents has been carried out on a large scale as an *association project*, and can, if needed, be tackled still.^{IV} It has to also be considered that the association forgers have mostly worked with a long-term view – the forgeries rest for many decades in a library, in the rubble of an old Roman or Egyptian ruin or burial place, before they are "planfully" discovered!^V – which is connected to the fact that such actions are not undertaken for the sake of some material gain, but certain "idealistic" causes. We are well advised to not ignore the consideration that archaeological forgeries can be carried out as commissioned work, so that not the forger, but the commissioning party is the driving force that determines the enterprise's objective and path.

We now take to task an example in order to demonstrate the general by the particular and concrete.

Up to the year 1850, there were four big, old *bible handwritings of parchment* known, which were likely all complete originally, i.e. they contained the Old and the New testament in Greek language. Today however, all handwritings often show considerable gaps, and one

IV "Nuremberg trials"! Just saying.

V This is not the first time (and likely, not the last, either) that the speech marks are in the wrong place. Logically, the word "discovered" should have had them, not "planfully", in order to make sense of the speech marks being used ironically (for mockery purposes).

(D) consists of only the gospels and the acts. These four handwritings are: *Codex Alexandrinus* (A), *Codex Vaticanus* (B), *Codex Ephraemi* (C), *Codex Bezae* (D). We will soon thoroughly concern ourselves with these big four; for now, it may suffice to say that they are supposedly remainders from the 4th to the 5th century.

In the year 1859 in the world of theology, there was a gigantic surprise: a protestant theologian, *Konstantin von Tischendorf*, brought from the orient a new-testamentarian handwriting to Petersburg which, in age and textual significance, was ranked equal to the four main codices. It is the famous – famous also by its external fate – *Codex Sinaiticus* (S or also Aleph), today in the British Museum, London. The discovery occurred under exciting circumstances in a monastery situated at the foot of [Mount] Sinai. The on valuable parchment written, luxurious specimen had already prior to *Tischendorf's* arrival been "chopped up" in the monastery, and our traveller noticed (already at an earlier visit) loose sheets of parchment of the script, that had been intended for the oven by the monks! [Yeah, right.] So, *Tischendorf* got there just in time in order to save the valuable treasure from utter destruction. How slovenly, and primarily, how dumb must those monks yet have been, that none of them, not even the librarian and the abbot of the monastery, understood the value of the time-honoured codex; of all things, they wanted to use the best piece of their stock for fuel!

But let us return to the problems of handwriting forgeries. We quote *Fr G Kenyon*: "*A strange coincidence took place after von Tischendorf's discovery had become known. Around 1855, an inventive Greek, Konstantin Simonides, had brought a number of handwritings to London, also amongst them an allegedly lost Egyptian history by a certain Uranius. The well-known scholar W Dindorf considered them authentic and prepared an edition. But when a few sheets had already been printed, another German scholar discovered that the chronology quite obviously originated from a modern depiction. After a brief exchange, the fraud was*

revealed. [von] Tischendorf was involved in the swindler's exposure, and Simonides took revenge by declaring that the Uranius be entirely authentic, but that he had written another script himself, namely the Codex Sinaiticus which he, in 1840, had produced on mount Athos modelled after a Moscow bible over a period of around six months. The impossibility of this story was obvious, because in 1840, Simonides was only 15 years old, it was quite impossible for him to get 350 large sheets of old parchment, the copy wouldn't allow for it to be completed within 6 months, and a Moscow bible edition with a similar text does not even exist. Furthermore, the text has been written by no less than three different writers and shows a large number of corrections by different hands... What is also telling for Simonides' character is that a little later, he reported that among the Egyptian collection of a man in Liverpool, he found a papyrus specimen by Matthew, supposedly written fifteen years after the ascension, together with handwritings of the Jacob and Judas letters from the 1st century, and other similarly exciting things.^{VI} These brilliant forgeries can still to be viewed today in Liverpool."¹⁴

The above report contains highly interesting messages. First off, the reader finds my claim confirmed, that palaeographers excel by an unusually high degree of gullibility; because the expert scientist *W Dindorf* flatly fell for a forged "old" handwriting. Naturally, the scholar had examined the specimen thoroughly by all rules of the relativity method with the result that the external attributes (material and writing) quite guaranteed to him age and authenticity of the script. So, regarding the external attributes, copying the genuine article had succeeded magnificently, and the forgery, "externally", would probably not have been uncovered, had the forger not committed an inexcusable "internal" error. A necessary part of the "old"-Egyptian history would have been a chronological guide. Now, everybody knowledgeable knows that in the early Egyptian chronology, the greatest confusion and

VI Wow! This guy (Simonides) has some dizzying imagination, no? And stupendous nerve... Like little 5 to 10 year-old kids when they haven't quite worked out yet that they might be found out – un-be-lie-va-ble!

insecurity are the rule; amongst the Egyptologists around 1850, there could therefore be no mention of a uniformity of opinions at all. Now, how do I behave in the face of such chronological difficulties? So asked himself a certain "Uranius" as well, and he dug himself the trap, when he based his description on a *modern* chronology, which could naturally not remain unnoticed for long. He would have been smarter, had he played dumb, and fantasized together his own chronological system loosely based upon early Egyptian lists of data; the scholars would then have even been grateful to him for the heap of new timetable problems.^{VII}

Kenyon's messages regarding the *Codex Sinaiticus* arouse our interest no less strongly. So, the inventive Greek *Simonides*, driven by vengeance against *Tischendorf*, claims that the *Uranius* is genuine, that, on the other hand, the *Codex Sinaiticus* is false; it does not stem from perhaps the 4th century, but is the modern product of his skilled forger hands. Upon such confession, great puzzlement and outrage broke out among theologians and palaeographers alike, who did not want have such magnificent old script taken from their hands. Let us now examine the by *Kenyon* referenced facts, which shall prove that *Simonides* *cannot* at all even be in question as the forger of the bible script.

When in 1840 he claimed to have committed the forgery, *Simonides* was only 15 years old; but a switched-on youngster, should he have an eye for such things, is at the age of 15 very well capable of copying handwriting after a template. *Simonides* claimed having produced the copy over a period of 6 months, but that should be quite impossible; as *Kenyon* reports, there were at least three writers busy on the *Codex*, one of whom wrote the whole NT (and the Barnabas letter). It would indeed mean an enormous performance to copy the gospels, the acts, all letters and the apocalypse in only half a year; but it could be that

VII This all sounds like you have to first prove, beyond any doubt, that you're dumber than toast before you can 'qualify' as an expert scientist or scholar, does it not? (Let us not disrespect toast, though; at least, you can eat it – Ens!)

Simonides, regarding the duration, has bragged a little, and that in truth, he took a few months more. By the way, the handwriting shows clearly that the scribe has worked extraordinarily sloppily with regards to textual accuracy, because the script has been zealously corrected immediately on completion. And the writer left seven sheets blank anyhow (10, 15, 28, 29, 88, 91, 126), which were filled in by a different hand! This is a peculiar diagnosis, hinting at the collectivity of the work. Concerning the writing material, we have to agree with *Kenyon*: it is out of the question that the 15-year old *Simonides* could have procured 350 large sheets of old parchment on his own account. What however, if *Simonides* did not act on his own account and from own initiative? If he had been merely doing commissioned work, been just a helper's helper? *Simonides* does not mention customers; he may have had valid reasons to keep silent about this. If he had really produced the script himself, we *must* account for helpers' helpers, namely preparatory workers (and ultimately, secret leaders of the enterprise). He must then have had a *model* (alleged Moscow bible) at his disposal, that is, supplied to him by the customer. This follows with full clarity from the peculiarities of the *text* that the Codex Sinaiticus offers. The text is most intricately and to the 'T' contemplated and designed, and *in this*, only dogmatically trained brains could have been at work.

Let us summarise: it is not on to simply declare a forgery of the Codex Sinaiticus by *Simonides* impossible; if the Greek had been an order taker, he could have well performed such an undertaking. Besides this, *Simonides* may have been pro-actively realising his own forgery plans, because we hear of brilliant forgeries that can be admired in Liverpool today. With the Matthew gospel on papyrus, the good *Simonides* hit the market a hundred years too soon. In our day, we no longer find fault with a gospel written 15 years after Christ's ascension, and we would welcome with joy any papyrus containing such information,

provided that by material and handwriting, it looks "genuine". Today, the discovery of the primeval script of a gospel is quite within the realm of possibility.^{VIII}

How difficult – why, often quite impossible – it is to distinguish a skillfully forged "old" script from "authentic" pieces by external properties (material and handwriting) – for this, the expert *W Dindorf* with his *Uranus* has delivered an example. I could now easily extend the series of such obvious cases, but I would have to be prepared for the justified objection: these are always *individual occurrences*, found in all sciences, because erring is human. To be fair, the prerogative of erring has to also be granted to every papyrologist and parchmentologist. It is of course not really all that bad, if now and again, a papyrologist falls victim to an error; big damage for his science needs not be incurred by it. Therefore, let us not concern ourselves further with individual cases, let us much rather take a closer look at *papyrology as a whole*, let us scrutinise the entire papyrology, that is, with regards to its character *as an exact science*. If occasionally, a representative of his discipline errs, then such error does not touch the character of the relevant discipline; but assuming that almost *all* representatives err, and not perhaps in unimportant, peripheral points, but assuming that this *shared* error refers to the heart, to fundamentals, then this specialist discipline can claim no entitlement to be respected as an all-round exact science. And the trust in the exactitude of papyrological occupation suffers ultimate wreckage in the face of the statement that the papyrologists could have proclaimed such shared major errors only because they had been lead by the nose.

For decades long, the following *two fundamental collective errors* have been rated and defended as "obvious facts" by the representatives of papyrology:

VIII This is one cracker statement for the '1940s/50's, no? I've never kept tabs on this – has this actually happened since then?

1. The "fact" that scripts of papyrus, for certain advantageous circumstances, could remain preserved *only in one single land (Egypt)*, and

2. the "fact" that with antique papyrus scripts, the *scroll form* had been the only one customary.

Papyrologists declare these errors to be excusable, even necessary. As scientists, they must stick to the objective facts of their discipline, and up to recently, it has been a fact that papyrus remainders had been dug up only in Egypt, and (from the first centuries) only in the form of scrolls. Sure, this is all correct; but we cannot spare the representatives of papyrology the accusation that they have neglected examining whether the fundamental facts of their science really are of natural origin, or whether they have been created artificially. We want to make up for this momentous neglect. The great task cannot be fulfilled with occasional spot-checks for the authenticity of the papyri; we have to necessarily subject the papyrological overall complex to a sceptical-critical observation from a high observation platform.

IV. Caution! Artificial facts and artificial problems

We cannot begin this chapter any better than with the telling of a *Wagner* anecdote; I have referenced it once before in *The Falsification of German History*. In his *Wagner* biography, *C Fr Glasenapp* reports the following: "When the party was enjoying themselves in the shady alleys of the park, the master [*Wagner*] steered the attention of his company, a young nature researcher, to a glass globe sitting on top of a column which strangely felt cold on top and warm at the bottom. The nature researcher gave an explanatory lecture on the deflection of

rays. When he had finished, Wagner said laughingly: »Way off target, Doctor! I just turned the globe around, so that the side warmed up by the sun came bottom.«"

The pretty anecdote may serve us as a spotlight with which we highlight the scientific state of affairs in papyrology. By turning the globe, *Wagner* created a particular and peculiar situation, a new fact; however, this fact did not form in a natural way, it was an artificial one, in the true sense of the word a *twisted fact*. And the problem with whose solution the doctor strained himself, was an *artificial problem*. The learned nature researcher started, as the fundamental requirement of all sciences demands, with an indubitable fact: that globe was really warm at the bottom. Facts have to be acknowledged, and we have to try and explain them. The doctor did this, and in all seriousness, too, without noticing that here, he was deceived by an artificial fact. By the way, he behaved all-round as a man of the trade, also by not considering to wonder about the strange fact.

Namely in general, learned folk do principally not easily wonder in matters of their own discipline which, as we have just seen, can have fatal consequences. In each wondering, there is always a portion of scepticism co-vibrating, and it is signalling to the observing scientist: Caution!

Especially the representatives of the historical sciences, all the more in cases where the material is concerned with the old history, should not ignore the warning to be sceptical in investigations which extend to the authenticity of the handed down material. But it is not enough to only deploy the customary caution in small and individual things; from time to time, a sceptical observation of the chief facts penetrating the core is necessary, in each science, that is. Even gigantic globes can have been cunningly twisted by powerful hands! *Wagner* acted out of a joking mood when he placed a meaningless object in a different position; he has then straight away candidly opened the doctor's eyes on the situation's

artificial nature. But what if in all earnestness, and for grave reasons, someone had once created artificial general facts of the utmost significance, and the manipulators [this someone] had all cause to forever remain silent about the undertaking! Then, it can happen – papyrology is offering to us a beautiful example, a show – that all too gullible scholars fall for the swindle even collectively.

The reader is now prepared to step up to the *gigantic globe of the papyrological science* with intense attention. First of all, it may be useful if we placed ourselves 30 years back; we want to take note of what the scholars of this trade observed regarding the chief facts of their discipline back then, and what explanations they had to offer. This is firstly about the subject:

The preservation of antique new-testamentarian papyri

Before entering the discussion, it shall be pointed out once more that temporarily, and against better knowledge, we take the viewpoint that Jesus and the "primeval Christians" are historical figures.

In order to enable us to judge what papyri of new-testamentarian content were *preserved*, it will be good to hear, what perhaps even *existed* in the first few centuries (or, what should have existed, respectively). On this, some hints are found in the "old" tradition itself: supposedly, even in the earliest times, there was no shortage of christian literature in the communities. It does of course also go without saying that with Christianity's character as a religion of history and books, authentic written testimony on the "gospel" should have been readily available, in order to be used in catechism and sermon as the foundation of faith. Without the gospels and the letters of Paul, no community was able to develop a true life of faith. And not only as a matter of office, they had to be intent on procuring and preserving the holy scripts; some Christians also felt the need as private persons to have a copy made for

them. As we remember: as early as the year 120, even John's gospel had supposedly been copied in Egypt. "From the beginning", the other gospels and the apostle letters were of course no less popular and disseminated within Christianity. It would thus have to be assumed that perhaps around the year 300, new-testamentarian literature on papyrus existed plentiful, and that it was carefully looked after.

We now ask the question (by placing ourselves around three decades back): of the great mass of biblical papyri *from the first three centuries*, what has been preserved? Answer: nothing, or at least *as good as nothing*, was preserved. Since there is a papyrologist just standing next to us before the great "globe", we ask him for an explanation for this utterly negative result. That no new-testamentarian papyri from such early times are preserved has several causes, the doctor replies; firstly, one mustn't forget that much christian literature had to perish as a result of the persecutions. This explanation seems to make sense to us, but since we ourselves are educated on the papyrological overall situation as well, something important occurs to us: then how does it come, Doctor, that from the very considerable mass of *literary* papyri (of the on papyrus preserved works of the Greek-Roman poets, philosophers, historians), so little has been preserved from the first three centuries?

The papyrological discoveries of the first half of the 19th century brought to light almost exclusively document material (documents from everyday life). Only sporadically, literary pieces then turned up (predominantly, fragments of Homer's *Ilias*). Only in 1880, we hear of fragments by Aristotle; 1905/06, fragments of Euripides, Sophokles, Demosthenes, Pindaru and others were surfaced. All in all, even today, the papyrological harvest is lamentable. And only when *biblical* discoveries began occurring, literary fragments made an appearance, too.

After all, there really was not the slightest danger that such *worldly* scrolls could have been systematically destroyed by the authorities. The affair is indeed remarkable, our expert replies, but then goes on to hint that the actual, deeper root cause of the loss of the antique papyrus scripts is to be found in a different, grave circumstance, and now we learn: the loss of so many old papyri is explained by the *nature of the writing material*.

*"Old papyrus turns brittle in dryness, and begins rotting in dampness; thus, under normal climatic conditions, longevity is not to be expected of the papyrus handwritings."*¹⁵ Now, dear reader, we quote a famous statement by having *Kenyon* proclaim to us the chief axiom of the papyrological science: *"Only in one single land, the conditions of their preservation were more advantageous."* Where is this blessed land? *"In Egypt, South of the delta and beyond the flooding area of the Nile, the climate is so dry, that handwritings which lay in the ground may become brittle, but besides that, they remain preserved almost infinitely long. It is just in Egypt now, where large amounts of papyri have been found in the last decades."*¹⁶

In one single land only! Privileged Egypt! This chief truth stood like a rock amongst all experts of the papyrological science. Of course, this truth was based upon an objective fact: only in *Egypt*, antique *papyri* were found. The expert does not wonder about "facts", he has to acknowledge them. The papyrologists were, and still are today, only too happily prepared to acknowledge the "Egyptian" facts, because they desperately needed material in order to erect with it the structure that is papyrology.

Why then is Egypt the only land in which old papyri could survive? Because only here, the climatic conditions are set to favour a preservation of the fragile material, is the answer. Primarily, dryness is required.

Twenty years ago, when I was first concerned with the state of the papyrological "globe", I wrote the following regarding the uniquely dry climate in Egypt: *"We mull this allegedly so "natural" explanation over once and again; but behold! Suddenly we find that this explanation does not appear natural at all. What? Did then yet other areas in which the "old" Christians lived not possess a dry climate and still do? Indeed! For example Arabia and Syria. So, why then have not at least as many christian papyrus sheets been preserved here as they have in the neighbourhood of the Nile? Our expert remains silent... He does not remain silent for long however, because his knowledge again offers to him a "natural" explanation why outside Egypt, no christian papyri have been found. Simply because the papyrus plant chiefly thrived in Egypt, is the explanation. It goes without saying, where the most papyrus existed, the most in terms of papyri of the NT could be preserved... The affair would be in order and really quite natural if consequently, the most had been preserved in Egypt, and accordingly less in Arabia, Syria etc. But what is the situation? In Egypt itself, next to nothing has been preserved – in terms of new-testamentarian papyri – and purely nothing at all in other equally dry areas."*

As has been mentioned, the above statements give a description of the papyrological situation and chief views from a couple of decades ago. It has to be remarked that insightful representatives of their trade do not view things quite so simplistic-schematically. In 1918, *W Schubert* said: *"The dryness of the Egyptian climate... has an effect as well, but in no way crucially, because especially on the edge of the desert, where the conditions for the preservation of papyri are the most favourable, local rain, and even hefty gushes occur more frequently than elsewhere."*¹⁷ What now? Do we read this right? There can be no talk at all of particular dryness in the areas of the land by the Nile, where papyri from "old" times are found? The affair is beginning to turn sinister. According to this, Egypt does not at all excel by "particularly favourable" climatic conditions – and yet, only by the Nile, papyri are

brought to light! At least until up to a few decades ago, it was so. What wondrous fact, what wondrous problem!

According to the dryness dogma, we should assume that papyrus discoveries occur in Egypt only far off the Nile in the desert. We are all the more amazed when looking at the map in *K Preisendanz – Papyruskunde*.¹⁸ All important locations of discovery are listed here, and it turns out that – besides the places in the Fayum area – almost all locations are situated only a few kilometres from the Nile. Why, in 1904, on an island situated in the middle of the Nile (Elephantine), of all places, papyrus scrolls have been unearthed from a mound of rubble, which allegedly stem from the 5th pre-Christian century, and which have – despite age and dampness! – been "in mostly good condition".¹⁹ Of course, the circumstances of the discoveries on this island were subject to change: "*Thus, they encountered papyri even as little as 0.5 m deep [approx. 20 inches] under today's ground level in loose rubble next to straw and smithereens... Again elsewhere however, the dampness had progressed so precariously that it had completely decomposed the once existing scrolls...*"²⁰ About the finding places of the Fayum area as well, it is reported that the "damp ground" had a devastating effect on the fabric of the papyrus there.²¹

So, nothing with the famed dryness in many of the Egyptian finding places, and the uppermost thesis of the papyrological science quite obviously turns out to be indefensible, embarrassing information. Under utilisation of the required dose of scepticism, we could have long recognised the artificial nature of Egypt's preferred status, and with it, the entire unnatural nature of the papyrological overall situation. Yet, we still carry on bowing in obedience to facts that are none. Such gullibility had to be punished, especially in a *historical* science whose research for truth is impossible without a watchful scepticism at all times.

If not only individual papyrologists, but all representatives of this discipline seriously proclaim: only in one single land, in Egypt, antique papyri were able to survive "*thanks to the dryness of its climate*", then, this is a warning sign for the fact that something is not right in the innermost of their science. A science that gives cause to such nonsensical claim cannot be sound, it has to suffer from an inherited infliction which has contaminated the entire organism. It would be a simple matter to learn from geographers and meteorologist that there are many areas in the orient which possess a climate equal or similar to that in Egypt. Also, not alone the climate is crucial, but the ground conditions as well, and especially those are often most unfavourable for the preservation of papyrus material at the finding places by the Nile and in the Fayum area in Egypt. We will hear still more about this.

But the papyrologists closed their eyes before the real facts, and insisted on their chief dogma. This is why their surprise was not a small one, when in the beginning of the 1930s, this message went around the world: "*age-old*" papyri have now also been found outside Egypt! Really? "But that cannot be possible at all", some might have said; papyri can preserve by the Nile only. There is something comedic and at the same time shattering about it, when Kenyon – who, as we remember, previously stood for the thesis of the Nile area's chosen status – in an acknowledgement presents the following correction now: "*Only in the last decades have Papyri been found outside Egypt, that is, in areas such as Dura in Northern Syria, or in South Palestine's desert, where the conditions for the preservation were similarly favourable.*"²²

If we were now to assume that by the parallel discoveries in Palestine and by the Euphrates the state of affairs in the papyrological realm had been clarified, that things would be simpler now, more understandable, more natural, then we would be committing yet another grave mistake. Things have merely become still more inconceivable. We must ask now: *Why do papyri surface in the orient outside Egypt only nowadays?* After all, "primeval

Christians" allegedly also lived in these areas in the first centuries – to say nothing of other inhabitants – who also zealously wrote on papyrus! The papyrological estate of these humans could in principle - since of course the conditions were "similarly favourable" as in Egypt! – also preserve well. Why did these "treasures" stay hidden *until today*? Excavations have been organised in these areas as well for a long time – papyri? The [archaeological] spade brought none to light! Until around 1930, when the restriction was suddenly lifted. Now, Earth is going into labour here, too; and papyrologists and parchmentologists carefreely place themselves onto the new plane of the (artificial) facts.

V. A papyrological dilemma and its consequences

Previously, it has already been noticed that in relation to the in masses excavated papyri of *secular* content, the gains in terms of *new-testamentarian* pieces are minimal. This must surprise. If we consider that as early as in the first centuries, many scribes in Egypt have supposedly been busy producing copies of the NT, or at least individual parts thereof (gospels etc.), then we have good cause to be surprised over the previous infertility of the Egyptian soil with regards to biblical material. We want to reference numbers, in order to demonstrate how uncommonly rare new-testamentarian papyrus findings have been up until recently.

"Currently, the official list of Greek handwritings of the new testament contains 68 papyri", Aland writes.²³ The minuteness of the stock is highlighted by the fact that – besides the most recent finds – the mentioned numbers denote only individual sheets, or even only one sheet or the fragment of a sheet, respectively. In 1923, there were only 232 numbers of mostly individual sheets or rags; then, the discoveries followed in an ever quicker succession,

and more than anything, the pieces now became ever more voluminous. We will soon learn more on this. Next, an affair shall concern us which, next to the dryness dogma, puts the most important papyrological subject of our time up for discussion. The subject is this:

The papyrologists' second fundamental error

All of us have learned that in Antiquity, papyrus handwritings have been produced in the form of scrolls. From the marrow of the stems, sheets were pressed, glued to each other, and thus, we had long strips that could be written on, and rolled up to a scroll around a staff. As is well-known, such scrolls have appeared in larger numbers for the first time around 1750 during excavations of Herculaneum, buried in the year 79 during a Vesuvius outbreak. Back then, over 500 scrolls were found, which were however – because pasted up, pressed flat and singed - in a hopeless state. Of the many, still unsolved problems that Herculaneum and Pompeii pose to the archaeological science – there are artificial problems and facts amongst them as well! – we are interested in the one circumstance only: what was found were exclusively scrolls, no codices.

A codex is a "book", that is, the form of material to be written on, where layers of sheets that are folded in the middle get to lie on top of each other. Now, of what does the second chief error of papyrology consist? Still up into our century, it was considered a dogma that up until the first use of parchment in the 4th century, with papyrus, *only the scroll format* was *customary*. The scientists were entitled to their axiomatic claim – nay, duty-bound – by the objective fact that for the early times, papyri in the codex format were simply not found. Let us draw a mental picture of the prevailing situation in the papyrus market from only a couple of decades ago. There, secular papyrus scrolls from the early epoch came to light in masses; that means that by all means, papyrus codices should also have always appeared – assuming that there were even any hidden in Egypt's miracle soil. No codices surfaced

however, only ever scrolls, although since the middle of the last century, great systematic excavations have been going on. Now, if before the 4th century, written-on papyri in book format did really exist already – then why did they not make themselves known? Which Earth spirits were involved that up until recently, no codices were permitted to show themselves? We want to perhaps object that papyrus in book format is more sensitive to destructive influences than in scroll format? It stands against this that today of course, papyrus books –fabulously preserved in parts! – appear on the market.

The papyrologists do not seem to sense that there were wondrous things going on here, and still are going on. At first, the experts were very well surprised over the unexpected phenomenon; nowadays, they no longer find the affair even suspicious, but quite natural. However, can what happened here be *natural*? Again, this is a question that goes all out, a question which again aims at the heart of the papyrological science. This much is certain: if things were really natural here, then, we would be standing before something inconceivable, before a "natural" miracle. In that case then, mother nature would have had to make a fool of itself, because – *it contradicts itself*! Either the previous state was natural (namely, that in the first centuries, papyrus in book format did not exist), or the nowadays state is natural (then, papyrus books should have always been found). This is where nature is caught up in a dilemma, or much rather, papyrology is! The experts of course do not perceive the discrepancy, else they would not be able to remain so silent, but would draw the only possible conclusion from the situation: that (at least) the newly discovered papyrus codices *must* be forgeries. Because the dilemma is not of a natural, but an artificial origin.

Again, a papyrological pillar (the chief "fact" of the exclusiveness of the scroll format) collapsed, and the collapse has grave consequences with a far-reaching effect. In individual cases, it is now no longer required to deliver special proof for the claim *that all papyrus books discovered in the last decades* (or fragments thereof) represent *forgeries*. The

general proof necessarily follows from the artificial nature of the described dilemma, because real nature cannot contradict itself in this manner even in Egypt. The here with universal validity uttered verdict applies in particular to the *new-testamentarian* papyri, almost all of which of course are suspiciously lucky to re-appear in book format.

Let us not neglect to hear what *Kenyon* has to say on the subject: "*Only recently, it was still presumed that this format [the scroll; K.] had been the only one customary up to the beginning of the 4th century... However, the discoveries made especially in most recent times in Egypt have proven that as early as the first years of the 2nd century, it has been attempted to use papyrus in the codex format. It seems that this format has, if not invented by them, but at any rate, been most frequently used by the christian community.*"²⁴ The author seems to think that with this, he has presented something in the way of an explanation, but in truth, he now places the new-testamentarian papyri under suspicion all the more. Because of their external design, the christian pieces, involuntarily but fittingly, are presented as interpolations and foreign bodies. Because assuming for a moment that the Christians had (invented and) used the codex format increasingly frequently, then what in all the world kept those human beings from choosing the convenient codex format for the Pagan-literary writings as well? Because peculiarly, the scroll remained the most used format for the Pagan literature for another two centuries. *Kenyon* has not even realised where the problem's centre of gravity lies. Now as before, the crucial question is this: *why do the biblical codices show up during excavations only today, and why have we not met christian papyrus books earlier?* With the writing craze of the "old" Egyptian Christians, christian literature, and not only bibles, should have existed plentiful.

Kenyon's attempt at an explanation has failed; the dilemma remains alive in all its jeopardy for as long as it is considered natural; it disappears as soon as we draw the only possible ultimate conclusion: all new-testamentarian papyri must represent forgeries. Most of

these forgeries originate in our century, the oldest christian "fragments" in *papyrus* may stem from the middle of the last century.

In passing, let us for a moment contemplate just why the modern forgers chose the book format for biblical manuscript of papyrus. The writing-down of one of the more voluminous gospels in majuscule font of medium size requires a scroll of 10 to 12 metres length [approx. 30-36 feet]. In the face of such measurements, the "old" Christians should therefore, as long as the scroll format was simply still customary, have been glad to have together *one* gospel in this fashion. For modern machinations however, even a single gospel in the form of a scroll is too voluminous and inconvenient: why, we have to handle *prepared* papyrus, that is, with material which has been "aged" before rolling it up! Late "ageing" of the already rolled-up papyrus proves to be much more difficult. Because after the procedure, not only must "age-old" papyrus look old and brittle, it has to *be* really brittle, too, if it is meant to appear authentic. And now, the task is to roll up such brittle, 30 ft long strip of papyrus! The clever folks said to themselves: no, we will have it more convenient, we will risk it, and create papyrus in codex format! There was of course one risk: will the experts faithfully accept these codex surprises from such "early" centuries? To be on the safe side, let us first try a few minutiae, several sheets and rags from "lost old papyrus codices". It happened so; and behold, the world was well surprised, but remained faithful and proved itself willing to acknowledge the new "fact". And today? Stately in volume and flawlessly preserved, John's gospel in papyrus book format, among others, recently appeared on the stage of science.

Prior (since 1930), great *biblical* papyrus findings occurred already in book format, naturally. Back then, simply because of the previously unknown codex format, the so-called *Chester-Beatty-papyri* have aroused enormous attention. They represented a group of 12 (or 11, respectively) papyrus books which "*apparently, were found in a cemetery or in the ruins*

of a church in the vicinity of Aphroditopolis."²⁵ By the way, Aphroditopolis is situated only a few kilometres off the Nile! "*The entire collection was presumably the biblical library of a christian community in the 4th century. It comprises (besides books of the AT) parts of the gospels and the Acts, parts of handwritings of the letters of Paul, the revelation and the book of Henoch... The oldest handwriting is from the first half of the 2nd, the most recent no later than the 4th century, most of them belong to the 3rd century.*"²⁶ – These papyri are, one and all, modern forgeries. This follows from the discussed nature-dilemma already; we will furthermore, in a later place, deliver evidence for the actual falsification by the peculiarity of *inner* attributes (text variants).

Through a lecture held by the Geneve papyrologist Prof. *V Martin* in September 1956, the world has learned of a new great discovery, which has then been published under the signature "*Papyrus Bodmer II*". And again, there was a sensation: *John's gospel in a large volume on papyrus* from the time around 200! *Papyrus Bodmer II* – filed in the official list as P 66 – contains on 108 pages with one single gap "*John's gospel from the 1st verse up to 14,26 complete and uninterrupted; in this, the relevant text is almost unimpaired, only very occasionally, a letter or a syllable on the outer edge is destroyed.*"²⁷,^{IX} The "*downright fabulous preservation*" of this "*age-old*" papyrus book is praised, but unfortunately, we are left in the unclear on other, particularly noteworthy things. "*Martin's publication tells us nothing on the place and the circumstances of his find, or the route by which the papyrus arrived in Switzerland. Here, things are obviously as they are in numerous other cases: place and circumstances of the find are carefully kept in the dark by the excavator, or dealer or mediator respectively, for obvious reasons.*"²⁸ About the work of the "*old*" scribe we learn: "*Practically, each page of the codex contains corrections. The scribe has obviously performed his task mechanically, without deeper understanding. He has not only omitted*

IX I confess: if it weren't for the comedic qualities of Kammeier's work, I'd feel a little less inclined to translate it. Why do we as mankind love so much being lied to?

letters and syllables, but also words and entire groups of words. Martin counts no less than 22 significant omissions. All of them are corrected, that is, by the scribe himself immediately after completion, or even during his work." – Naturally, our conclusion from the codex dilemma is also valid for this fabulously preserved gospel of John, here as well however, extra proof for the forgery can be generated from the procedure peculiar to this piece.

Some readers may ask themselves now: is it credible that experts should not be capable of de-masking such forgeries? Answer: yes, under utilisation of their (relative) method, they are not capable of it. As ridiculous as this may sound, it is so nonetheless: experts (palaeographers) may well be capable of establishing the relative (!) "*authenticity*" of a well-produced forgery, but they are incapable of proving the spuriousness of an in every aspect successful forgery! This fact reveals the entire tragedy of all palaeographic and historical work per se. The *relative* method irresistibly lures its users from solid ground into the swamp. We are to pose any random papyrologist the task of proving the (indubitable) spuriousness of P 52 – he will not be capable of doing so. Our papyrologist will carry out his (relative) comparison examination, and it will force him to the statement that the specimen at hand is authentic, because all external attributes (handwriting, nature of the material), carry the hallmarks of authenticity. It is of course easy to reveal botched work; but the modern masters of the forging arts have long known that only flawless forgeries, produced with scientific exactitude, can pass the authenticity test. To lend a handwritten forgery of papyrus or parchment the character of relative authenticity, depending on the desired state of the material or writing, is no longer a difficult problem (although isotopes have to be deployed in this!).^x Even 100 years ago, this was understood by a *Simonides*, and others before and after him could do this better still, especially when the work was done in learned community.

X Is this not another most remarkable statement?

Only the by myself practised *absolute* method can come to ultimate decisions in questions of authenticity. The critical eye in this is always centred on a *whole*, as has been demonstrated during the discussion of the two central dogmas of papyrology. We deliver general proof, not isolated, individual proof, because we are concerned with the nature of papyrology (as well as parchmentology) as an overall phenomenon. Therefore, the track of our evidence does not lead along the inductive path, i.e. we do not pick out individual cases, but we operate deductively by stepping down from the general (a general phenomenon) to the particular. From the realisation of a general situation (e.g. papyrological dryness dogma), the yard sticks for the assessment of individual facts are derived. As soon as it turns out that the alleged *fundamental* truths of a science (here: the papyrological one) are slapped together^{XI} artificially, such observation must have a devastating effect on the entire stock of the also included facts. If the big supporting columns of a building are rotten, then already, judgement on the remaining building parts has been passed in a negative sense by that fact.

Two papyrological columns are broken; twice, general evidence has been delivered; two main witnesses have given their statements, and their statements concur in the final result: the great papyrological globe must have been turned in a certain direction (with a certain intent!). He who is used to thinking in large-scale overview, will offhand draw the critical consequences from the general cases for the particular individual ones as well.

Such papyrological special case is for example the existence of so-called *Libelli*. These are certificates with which the Roman authorities confirmed to Christians that they had performed the publically demanded sacrifices for the Gods. From our realisation of the general nature of the forgery character of the biblical papyrology, it follows irrefutably that these *Libelli* – which by the way begin surfacing only during excavations around the turn of

XI Orig.: "erkünstelt", which is not an entirely 'proper' German word; needless to say that there is no known English language equivalent, at least none I know of.

the century ['19'th/'20'th] – are forgeries as well. The purpose of the forgery is obvious: the existence of these certificates of sacrifice is designed to prove and demonstrate that as early as the first centuries, there were Christians living and being persecuted in Egypt. The existence of the papyri "testifies to" the existence of *Christians* by the Nile back then. All other miscellaneous "palpable signs" of life utterances of christian human beings from "age-old" days pursue this goal as well, e.g. a found "christian original letter", which had allegedly been written by an Egyptian from Rome to his "brothers" in the Fayum district around 270. The letter may show (relatively!) authentic attributes regarding handwriting and material as much as it wants, the artificial disguise is of no use to it; there can be – based on the general papyrological diagnosis – no mention of historical authenticity. The general verdict also refers to the in 1930 excavated papyrus books with writings of the Manichaeian sect in Coptic translation, allegedly from 350-400. (Had papyrus books from the named epoch even existed, such pieces should have *always* come to light individually, not in masses since only a few decades ago.) The same goes *for all* papyrus scrolls and books, which since 1920, have now happily – despite the on papyrus devastating climate outside Egypt! – been excavated in Mesopotamia and Palestine, and still are excavated.

Nor is it on to declare biblical papyri authentic for the reason that in some cases, they have been met in the rubble together with secular writings and certificates. Smart forgers (forgery associations^{XII}) have of course realised how much the faith in the "authenticity" of biblical specimen can be enhanced if they get forged secular specimen for company as support. The mentioned Libelli are designed to have the effect of such authenticity amplifiers.

Now, just so the reader will not perhaps gain the impression that we wanted to determine the "deductive" way of critique to be the only valid one, it shall be remarked that naturally, it can and must also be proceeded working inductively. Special and individual

XII Begging to differ on the plural – this is all about one, and one only, 'association'.

investigations are equally as useful as they are necessary. However, they will not turn out any other general results than the procedure criticising the overall state. They make an appearance as secondary witnesses who report on individual observations regarding the unfolding of the main actions, and who make the picture as a whole flash up in clarity. An extended description of such special investigations must be reserved for an extra book; in this place, it is principally about the overall whole, so that details can only be given as samples.

We do not want to keep from the reader the following highly interesting details about the Egyptian *finding places*. "*For one, there are the ruins of houses..., from which so many "depot finds" have been unearthed, family papers, or else somehow connected complexes of documents stored in pitchers and little boxes. However, more productive are the garbage mounds of the villages and rural towns, where the as waste paper eliminated files of the administration offices went as well as all sorts of private folks' papers.*"²⁹ Just to have this clear right away: that the quoted author, *Fr Zucker*, chiefly has his eye on the gigantic mass of secular Greek-Roman papyri. We are interested in these pieces merely on the side; but we want to point out that – as proven by the *more detailed circumstances of the discovery* – the forgers have been zealously working in the realm of "pre-christian" Egyptian papyri as well.

What localities are famed as particularly productive finding places? The in many places in Egypt existing *garbage mounds*. Here, garbage mounds euphemistically stand for dung heaps, because the Fellahs also appreciate such mounds of rubble as supply depots for excellent fertilizer; with the on such occasion found papyri, they then generate a good side income as well. What do such mounds (called Koms^{XIII}) look like on the inside? No different to what dung heaps tend to also look like elsewhere in the world. In them, we find "*the manifold decomposing components of the garbage heaps, mixed with the most varied waste*

XIII Kôms, Köms – what have you? This here book has both in the original, 3x Kôms, 2x Köms, so far. None of my library knows anything at all on Egyptian dung heaps. So, I translated 'Koms'. Sue me.

of animals and plants."³⁰ And we also find in these Koms – since 1880 in increasing amounts! – things, precious valuables, which else are not offered by dung heaps: "age-old" papyri, which have once, after their elimination, been deposited here with the garbage. Some pieces are of course badly spoiled because of the dampness (!), but in many cases, the papyri present themselves in a good state of preservation still today. We should not quickly skip over the here described circumstances, it is recommended to think about this for a few minutes. So, the old Egyptians dumped, next to their sweepings and rotting waste of all kinds, dispatched masses of papyri on the heaps as well. All that now lay there, wildly mixed, exposed to the sun, the wind, the rain; the Koms were not perhaps situated far off the villages and towns, so ever anew, rubbish went on the heap (often again with papyrus waste among it). This carried on for years and decades, and decomposition and destruction took their course uninhibitedly. What is gained by the Fellahs from such rubble piles today, is the natural end product of the *decomposition processes during the period of usage*, namely valuable compost containing nitrogen. Later, after a hundred or more years, when those places were abandoned by people and turned void, only then, the desert sand could push forward and spread a protective blanket over the Koms. For the well-being of the papyrus waste of course, which was rotting between rubble and sweepings, a protective blanket came too late. The destruction was already complete. *This* is how things had to develop inside the garbage mounds, if and as much as things developed in a natural fashion.

By now however, we have experienced, and we still are continuously experiencing quite surprising things with the Egyptian sweepings mounds: the excavators unearth from them masses of remarkably well preserved papyri (almost all of secular content). What, in all seriousness, are we to say about these discovery circumstances? *Must* we rate this fact *natural*? We do not doubt the high age of some Koms, or, let us say more accurately: the high age of its basic mass. Nor do we doubt that in some of them – under favourable ground

conditions, and if the papyrus waste had been deposited, from the start (!) mixed with dry masses of rubble, as well as very soon receiving a protective layer of sand – even old papyri could be more or less well preserved. This much is certain however: if nothing had been wrong here, then, finds of even only fairly well preserved papyri should be an extraordinary rarity. And indeed: "*We hardly hear of papyri from the garbage mounds during the earlier period of discoveries* [i.e. before 1880; K.]." ³¹

At any rate, it is amazing how *since around 1900*, the finds and their circumstances, respectively, take on a different, *collective* character, as it were. The epoch of the isolated find is over; now, the Egyptian soil preferably delivers its papyrus treasures as "depot" contents! From 1900 onwards, the big "archive finds" occur thick and fast! From around 1900 onwards, papyri are more and more frequently found in pitchers and other vessels as well. Also, in 1880, the English archaeologist *Flinders Petri* has discovered mummies with pasted up papyrus cardboard at *Gurob* in the Fayum "for the first time in larger volumes". "*Here lay unpainted coffins ..., but on the inside, this papyrus mash consisted of the fairly good...material of papyri written in Greek and Demotic...The coffins as such remained well preserved: they had not been buried in tombs, but immediately in the sand, which probably preserved them.*" ³² The archaeologists and papyrologists who in all earnestness "scientifically" explain the until 1920 exclusively Egyptian existence of papyri with a preferable climate of the land by the Nile, who equally consider the until 1930 existing complete lack of *papyrus codices* as much as then their suddenly occurring appearance to be quite natural – these gullible experts *must* of course, according to their disposition, consider the peculiarities of the finding places and their circumstances natural phenomena as well. He however, who had themselves poked by the Egyptian-papyrological star, has also become

seeing in terms of individual details, and they recognise by so many tell-tale signs that for example in the case of the Koms as well, things have been planfully *artificialised*^{XIV}.

For papyrus forgers, a remote old garbage mound is the best and most convenient opportunity to deposit their forgeries in them for the purpose of a later rediscovery. It does thus not surprise us to hear: "*Complicated cases have delivered proof for shifts of the original layer positioning by a later digging-up of the mound.*"^{33, XV}. Clever people have done such things completely inconspicuously; but the safest way went by deciding to create entirely *new* mounds, and to supply them with purposefully treated and written-on papyrus waste. Depositing papyrological forgeries has also developed into a scientific skill.

At the end of this chapter, I most emphatically declare that I do *not* perhaps *identify* the publishers of papyrus texts, nor the discoverers, nor the excavators with the (unknown) forgers! [Unknown? Really??] The discoverer who can know nothing of the circumstances under which a papyrus has some time back – decades, or even several centuries ago – been forged and "buried", acts in good (and of course also in gullible) faith when he publicises his find as an age-old specimen. Oftentimes, falsifications are offered by dealers or mediators who smartly keep silent on the places or circumstances of the finds. In 1930-31, the already mentioned *Chester-Beatty-Papyri* appeared "*on the market in instalments, because the dealers wanted to first off explore the value of their possession.*"³⁴ Primarily, they wanted to probe for how the scientists would receive the miracle of these "early" *papyrus codices*! As is well-known, the surprises have been accepted with joy by papyrologists and theologists – for these "age-old" precious valuables looked charmingly authentic.

Readers who have attentively followed our discussions up to here, may now for a moment examine with a critical review of the described overall situation whether by now,

XIV Orig.: "gekünstelt"; see footnote IX: "slapped together artificially"

XV Sure, the more complicated, the more proof – like in the heliocentric world "model"; just so long as it "works on paper", which latter is patient, as is often forgotten.

they have also arrived at the conviction that the papyrological "globe" has been "turned" by secret hands. During such examination, they will do well constantly posing themselves the chief question: are the discussed papyrological phenomena, especially the two main phenomena, to be accepted as *natural* matters of fact? Once the reader gains the conviction of the *artificial* nature of the papyrological fundamental "truth", they will barely any longer be in doubt over the ultimate purpose of the globe's turning: by the existence of the biblical papyri, it shall be proven objectively-scientifically that the "historical" details of the bible (of the apostles and the church fathers) about the formation and the dissemination of Christianity (more precisely: the Jesusdom) in the first three centuries are correct. The extra task which the forgers addressed to papyrology is to deliver the relevant written testimony for the period up to the 4th century. Have now, as we have recognised, these vouchers been planfully forged on the big and the small scale, then it follows that before the 4th century, Christians (followers of the Jesus-religion) have existed neither in Egypt, nor elsewhere in the world. If we now assume that the roots of Jesusdom therefore lay in the 4th century, and that the gospels and other biblical scripts have also originated at that time (forged), they are jumping to a conclusion. Namely, for the time from the 4th century onwards, a different branch of the written tradition, *parchmentology*, supplies the necessary objective proof. How do things stand with this kind of hand-written testimony? This has to first be investigated yet. A new big critical task stands before us, and has to be completed. We thus call, beginning with the following chapter, the *parchment witnesses* before the bar of the court of critique.

VI. Secrets around the antique parchment codices

Parchment is more durable stuff than papyrus is. It has to therefore surprise us that no parchment codices from the time before 300 exist. We are patronised however: the lack in the earlier epoch is not striking, but can be taken for granted, because only from the 4th century onwards, parchment has become customary as a material for writing; before that, one wrote on papyrus. But of course, nothing can be taken for granted with a sceptical critic, especially when it supposedly concerns a phenomenon from the first centuries. The surprise is already waiting for us, too. The processing of animal skin into parchment has supposedly occurred as early as the 2nd century *before* the year 0, or even earlier still; and the thing that interests us the most: parchment had already been written on for a long time. *"Towards the end of the 1st post-christian century, there is material pointing to handwritings by Homer, Virgil, Cicero 'in membranis', i.e. on parchment."*³⁵ So, literary parchment codices existed in many places in considerable quantities before the 4th century. Where have they gone, these durable volumes? What fate have they met? All these parchment codices from the 1st to the 4th century have vanished off the face of the Earth without a trace! Can such disappearance be taken for granted? *After* the year 300, parchment books were permitted to be preserved everywhere, *before* the year 300, they perished, as it were, by a destructive disease! Whilst we are wondering over this peculiar phenomenon, the experts remain relaxed, and merely take note of the "objective fact". And so, *Kenyon* reckons: *"In the first quarter of the 4th century, one appeared to have all of a sudden noticed the great advantages of parchment and the lack of durability of papyrus."*³⁶

Before the start of our parchmentological investigations, let us remember the tactics which we follow at all times. As always, we start with the (against better knowledge assumed) premise that the handwritten tradition – here, the tradition on parchment – is

authentic, i.e. by and large untouched. Furthermore: in the parchmentological realm as well, we are not concerned with the assessment of details (occasional cases), but here as well, we care for the overall whole, we are intent on a general scrutinisation of the *situation* confronting us *in general*. We will not (so much) take pains for individual parchment codices, but have our eye on the *history* of the parchmentological codices and their fate over the course of the centuries. As always, at the beginning as well as at the end of our investigation stands the crucial question: can the described overall situation, the presented tradition history, be viewed as having formed *naturally*?

Certainly, our attention remains preferentially pointed at the tradition of biblical documents; however, it is unavoidable to now also draw into the circle of critique the handwritten tradition of *profane* parchments. To begin with, the handwritten tradition of the *Roman literature* will even be the main subject of our critical view. Already in the first centuries of course, the falsified history of Christianity (the church history) cannot at all be separated from the worldly history of those times. Both currents of historical events had to simultaneously merge, and carry on rolling over most tightly mixed in the shared bed.^{XVI} That means: the from the ground up *fictionalised history* of the origin and the further development of the christian church had to be *planfully worked in with the real history of those earlier centuries* by the authors of the great medieval falsification action. During the course of the procedure, the learned members of the forgers' association very soon realised that not much was to be gained by merely having the invented early church history popped on top of the historical reality. It had proven indispensable to *also very thoroughly redesign, i.e. to falsify – right to the core – the worldly history from the first century on*. Only fragments and splinters of the destroyed worldly history were suited for further use, and could be incorporated into the new building. If this indeed is the situation, then signs of the systematic falsification of

XVI Kammeier does have a picturesque style, does he not?

the worldly history must also be met in the *Roman* reports of those times; then the works of the *Roman historians* must also show the tell-tale signs of these machinations. It is also certain that not only historical *works* were forged, but that their alleged *authors* represent invented personalities.

Our subject is: what does the history of the handwritten tradition teach us regarding the preservation of parchment codices of profane (Roman) and clerical works from antiquity's final epoch? The answer is given by the following list. It gives information on the question: *from which centuries* (allegedly) do the *oldest handwritings* of Roman and christian writers stem?

Author	Work	Century
Sallust	Catalina (fragments)	4./5. (10.)
Virgil	Idylls	4./5. (9.)
Livius	history work	5. (11.)
Plinius the Elder	history of Nature	5. (10.)
Lactantius	christian writings	7. (9.)
Hieronymus	bible translation (Vulgate)	6.
Hieronymus	literature history	7. (8.)
Prudentius	christian poetry	5.
Augustinus	religious-clerical writings	6./7.
Orosius	christian world history	6.
Amminiamus Marcellinus	history work	6. (10.)
Jordanes	GOTH history	8.
Gregory of Tours	Franconian history	7.
Seneca	prose writings	8./9.
Horaz	poetry	9.
Vitruv	architecture	9. (11.)
Lucrez	poem on Nature	9.
Valerius Max.	history book	9.
Sueton	Emperor biographies	9.
Tertullian	church writings	9.
Ovid	metamorphosis	9.
Frontinus	war-related	9./10.
Caesar	"Denkwürdigkeiten" [lit.: "remarkabilities"]	9./10.
Plinius the Younger	letters	9./10.
Tacitus	Annals I-VI	9. (11.)
Tacitus	Annals XI-XVI	11.

The list is by no means complete, but completeness is not even necessary, because further entries change nothing anymore in the overall picture. Centuries in brackets report the next most recent parchment volume of the relevant work.

Our list shows that handwritings of Roman and old clerical writers from varying centuries are preserved. The oldest parchment volumes stem from the 5th century, other codices from the 6th-11th century. This seems to be quite a natural and not even particularly striking statement. Everybody will of course realise that during the times of the Roman Empire's collapse and in the confusion of the so-called migration of nations, the culture took damage and many parchment books were destroyed or else lost. Certainly, we realise that. Here however, we do not care what has been lost, but *what has been preserved!* And there, we can really count ourselves "lucky": because besides a few individual, nonetheless characteristic exceptions, *no significant work* by an eminent antique (Roman) author *was completely lost!* "Chance" has operated so exceedingly skilfully and precautionously, so that always at least *one* specimen (in more or less good condition) of the most important writings were saved from the troubles of the transition period between Antiquity and the Middle Ages. The list very vividly proves this. Namely, when next to Sallust, it says "4th/5th century", then that does not mean that there are many or at least multiple specimen in existence originating from that epoch, but it means: *one* volume (or fragments, respectively) is preserved, no more. A second specimen of Sallust then only appears again from the 10th century. The same goes – with next to no exceptions – for all antique profane and clerical authors.

We have ourselves patronised now, as to which circles we owe it that the Roman literature was not completely and utterly lost during those terrible centuries. The (falsified) history itself is kind enough to clarify this point for us. As "history" reports, the christian church, since the beginning of the 4th century, represented a power, a union which gained ever more followers and ever greater influence. The fate of the profane old scripts was thus strongly depending on how the Christians judged (supposedly!) their content. *"Ofentimes, the authors were read without lively understanding. Why, they were often used with aversion... In principle, the authors were damned, in practice, there was no avoiding them."*³⁷

In Rome during the 5th and 6th century now, men (Patricians) have zealously set to work in order to take care of the preservation and dissemination of their national (antique) literature. This follows from the subscriptions of some copyists (allegedly) from that time, which are partly preserved as originals, and have partly been handed down as copies together with them. These "early Roman Patricians" who were intent on the rescue of the old worldly writings have been Christians, according to *L Traube*³⁸, or at least originated from circles whose families would soon turn christian. Whether these men were Christians or not: when antiquity was tottering towards its grave, these Romans once again picked themselves up for great national deed by securing the further existence of the antique literature through planful multiplication of the handwritings.

By the efforts of those circles, numerous copies of all eminent works should have been created in the 5th and 6th century. If we add to this the "back then" still existing stock of "old" handwritings, then the old literature – and not only in Rome – was available in sufficient masses of parchment for the near future. It goes without saying that specimen were lost time and again, and the loss randomly hit this or that copy, just the way chance made it happen. Thus, if we were to find that of some antique works, more codices have made it across the threshold from antiquity to the Middle Ages than they have of other works, then that would of course be understandable and natural. What do we learn however? We pick up a most peculiar fact: on the threshold to the Middle Ages, there was a mysterious sentry standing on watch, who accurately controlled the loss and the preservation of the antique handwritings, following a plan! *Traube* characterises the situation, which "chance" has created here, as follows: "*Very often, only one single old handwriting of a text has entered Carolingian times... It is very rare on the other hand that one possessed multiple specimen of an author in the Carolingian Empire.*"³⁹ This fact is of course witnessed by our list as well. The one-specimen-preservation is also valid for the *christian* writings. This is all the more

momentous, because of course the church should quite particularly have had its heart set on securing its own tradition.

Let us for a few moments mull over the just experienced rule of chance. It – chance, of course! – has made it happen that *of all works* of Roman antiquity, *almost always only one specimen* has been rescued across into the Middle Ages. (The very rare exceptions do not count.) Because when in the 7th/8th century, clerics tackled the procreation of the antique writings with new zeal, they found – as early as back then! – the wondrous situation, that (still) only *one* handwriting of each Roman work existed. What luck: there was still *one* specimen to be found in the big Carolingian Empire yet. And the reader must now ask the crucial question, and answer it according to their understanding and life experience: could *chance* really have performed such planful work of selection? Can the described situation be viewed as the *natural* result of those factors that determine the loss, or the preservation of handwritings, respectively. By so asking, we leave the usual relative pseudo-critique behind us, and appeal to real life and its laws, i.e. we are pursuing "absolute" authenticity critique. Life now answers our question with: No! This was not the work of genuine chance. Genuine chance is not a worker by schedule. This situation however, during the transition of the handwritten material from antiquity to the Middle Ages, has unmistakeably been effected by purpose and plan. The *artificiality* of these alleged selection facts stands quite open in broad daylight.

The reader certainly has an objection at hand: then why, they justifiably ask, have the many researchers who are concerned with these things not long ago sensed and loudly proclaimed that the systematic one-specimen-preservation of all Roman works can be no coincidence? If the historians remain silent in this particular case, it has to be credited to them: first, most accurate handwriting comparison and text investigation was required in order to reach the final result that almost all specimen of a certain work – the ones preserved

from later centuries as well – are based upon *one single archetype* (primeval copy). Only as late as the beginning of our century, we had those things clear; since however, the historians could [should!] have recognised the artificial makings – *if* they had even asked themselves the crucial question (of the natural origin of the presented problem). However, up to this day, they have not dared look this "absolute" question in the eye. In principle, with regards to historical authenticity, only "relative" problems exist for our researchers. They are scared of absolute questions, and pacify their conscience with the admonishment: do not drive the critique over the top, do not be all too sceptical! More than anything, we must not go as far as doubting the whole (of the medieval tradition). That is why the historian-of-relative instinctively shies away from thinking about the naturalness, or artificiality of phenomena of the tradition, respectively, as soon as those phenomena stretch across the *entirety* of a historical epoch.

Let us return to the view of the preservation list. Besides other things, it states that many of the old codices originate only from as late as the 8th/9th^{XVII} century. This seems to be quite in order, because it is known from "history", how under the Carolingians, a full reversal of the assessment of the antique literature had set in. The old authors were dug up again – but almost nothing at all was found anymore; fortunately however, at least of each work still one single specimen, the last one! At the last minute, a rescue action was launched to save the famous "old" scripts from utter destruction, and in all monasteries of the Carolingian Empire, quills set in motion for this purpose. The question why monks' orders, of all things, did the best they could in order to rescue Pagan literature, is answered by *Traube* thus: "*The old ones were read, and they were copied, predominantly because of their style, rarely because of their content.*"⁴⁰ At this point, we are permitted to remain indifferent over

XVII Orig.: "879. Jahrhundert". Obviously, the scanner software (very soft ware, indeed; there are plenty of bugs in this here German language PDF copy, fortunately, all of them inconsequential) must have read the '/' as a '7', since there is no such thing as an '879th century' known to us regular carriers of NI (Natural Intelligence, which everybody has since the day they were born, if only everybody could realise).

what has supposedly moved monks and world clerics to so energetically supporting worldly books; important is that allegedly, there was busy copying going on everywhere. If we imagine the result in terms of quantity, then the bookshelves of the church and monastery libraries must have soon been stuffed full with copies.

We are now interested in two things: first, we have to learn that the Carolingian rescuers of literary antiquity have proven fairly carefree, why, even irresponsible in one point: they mercilessly let many of the venerable parchmentunika^{XVIII}, despite them possessing – by their rarity – the value of primeval script, perish before their eyes. This fate was encountered by a Horaz, Ovid, Lucrez as painfully as by a Caesar, Sueton and Tacitus. Why, the relevant "age-old" codices should have still been available to the copyists of the 8th/9th century. They have "gone under" however, and into their place stepped the Carolingian copies as the oldest witnesses.

Much more important is the following: if it already has the effect of arousing suspicion that almost without exception, *all originals*, that have made it to the Middle Ages by still only *one* specimen, *disappear without a trace* after their reproduction, then the following circumstance is that much more suspicious: namely, when we research just how much in terms of copied material existed *at the end of the Carolingian era*, then we are given an answer which latter is not exactly unsurprising. We at least expect to meet a quite considerable stock of reproduced codices, if we draw a mental picture of the situation in the 10th century. Only barely a century has passed since the great reproduction action – and what has been preserved? Answer: virtually nothing at all! Or, answered more accurately: chance has yet again worked so peculiarly and so precariously that after barely a hundred years, *of most of the Carolingian copies*, only ever *one* specimen of the relevant works was left over,

XVIII Orig.: "Pergamentunika". Nothing in my library on this, probably a collection of sorts, no? Stumped flat. Sorry.)

and has been left over up to this day! Or, we can put the answer thus: chance has made sure that *as few as even possible* has remained "preserved"! And to preserve less than *one* handwriting for each work was not very well possible (for the association forgers!). This time, the chief question: is the described situation to be viewed as natural, or does it have to be considered as having been produced artificially?, will be offhand answered by the reader. Any further discussion is superfluous here.

If in this chapter, we have been concerned with the external fate of the handwritings of works by *Roman* authors, we have nonetheless by no means allowed to be side-tracked by this intermediate act from the actual topic – critique of the handwritten tradition of the New Testament. Even with this necessary detour, we still always remain on the old track; because it turns out that the ultimate results gained during the investigation of the *secular* handwriting history are most beautifully supplemented and supported by our previous results regarding the christian-clerical tradition material. Such correspondence of the critique's results is of course to be taken for granted, too, since the (fictionalised) history of Christianity (the christian church), from the fading Antiquity onwards, temporarily coincides with the profane history and merges with it.

Already, the external critique of the Roman handwriting tradition has revealed tell-tale signs of artificially generated situations. Such machinations with codices can only have become necessary, because the contents of these parchment volumes also represent artificial products, i.e. they have been forged. Proving the falsification of the history of the Roman Emperors by the *content* of the antique source works is an extra task whose completion remains reserved for a later book.

We now leave the brief worldly detour, and take a turn back onto the christian (new-testamentarian) main road.

VII. Five venerable majuscule 'Methuselahs'

Primeval scripts of the books of the NT are not preserved; all the more favourable do things stand with the preservation of *copies*, if we still add on top of the Greek handwritings or fragments the very numerous codices in Latin, Syrian, Egyptian a.o. translation. Naturally, most important for establishing the "original" text are the handwritings in the native language of the alleged authors, i.e. the Greek versions of the codex copies.

We remember that writing down biblical books on *parchment* abruptly set in with the beginning of the 4th century, although for a long time already, the use of this durable writing material had no longer been novel. If we now ask what has been accumulated in terms of preserved *Greek* parchment manuscript of the NT up to now, we hear a surprisingly big number. In the year 1908, there were already 4026 handwritings; today, 4678 numbers are known overall, i.e. including the 68 papyrus fragments. This sounds grand, but the number's eminence considerably diminishes, when it is known that by far the majority of the handwritings stems from the 9th to 15th century. According to the character of the writing, these parchment codices of the late times are called *minuscules* (minuscules = the small letters). Since the handwritings *before* the 9th century have been generally written in capital letters, they are called *majuscules* (to palaeographers, majuscules are known as the square and capital font, as well as the "inch-sized" uncial).

The majority of the late minuscules is faced by only 232 *majuscules* from the 8th back to the 1st century. And even those are not to be imagined as well-preserved, or insignificantly damaged handwritings, respectively; with a few exceptions, these here as well are much rather individual parchment sheets and fragments. The following overview will confirm this. It represents the final part of the official list of the Greek new-testamentarian majuscules from 1953, and with each number, informs on writing material, alleged age of the

handwriting (i.e. from which century they supposedly originate) as well as the number of sheets and the text contents.⁴¹ XIX

Majuscules

No. 209	parchment	7th century	7 sheets	Paul
No. 210	parchment	7th century	2 sheets	John
No. 211	parchment	9th century	7 and 255 sheets	4 gospels
No. 212	parchment	3rd century	1 fragment	Tatian Diat.
No. 213	parchment	5th/6th century	1 fragment	Mark
No. 214	parchment	4th century	1 fragment	Mark
No. 215	parchment	4th/5th century	1 fragment	Mark
No. 216	parchment	5th century	2 fragments	John
No. 217	parchment	5th century	1 fragment	John
No. 218	parchment	5th century	1 fragment	John
No. 219	parchment	4th/5th century	1 fragment	Paul
No. 220	parchment	3rd/4th century	1 fragment	Paul
No. 221	parchment	4th century	1 fragment	Paul
No. 222	parchment	6th century	1 fragment	Paul
No. 223	parchment	6th century	1 fragment	Paul
No. 224	parchment	5th/6th century	1 fragment	Paul
No. 225	parchment	6th century	4 fragments	Paul
No. 226	parchment	5th century	1 fragment	Paul
No. 227	parchment	5th century	1 fragment	Hebrews
No. 228	parchment	4th century	1 fragment	Hebrews
No. 229	parchment	7th/8th century	1 double-sheet	Apocalypse
No. 230	parchment	4th/5th century	1 fragment	Paul
No. 231	parchment	4th century	1 fragment	Matthew
No. 232	parchment	3rd century	1 fragment	John

Thus, the final 24 numbers almost throughout denote only individual sheets, or fragments, respectively; merely one complete codex from the 9th century containing the four gospels is mentioned. And else, how do things stand with the *completeness* of the handwritings? Among the 232 majuscules, there are only 6 codices containing the whole NT.

XIX Hm, a '1953' list quoted from a book from '1800'? How does this one work out? Not that I'm suggesting to ignore the list for that reason, it's likely just a mash-up of endnote numbers or something similarly inconsequential to the overall work, but this is not something I would be able to find out from where I'm operating, i.e. except three different editions of the bible, I have no access to any of the works referenced by Kammeier.

Add to those still the 6 handwritings at least collectively comprising the gospels, and 5 codices with the letters of Paul. Remarkable is that even of the preserved 2400 minuscules of the later centuries, only a very small minority contain the entire NT. To prevent one misunderstanding right away, let us point out that a parchment handwriting of for example Paul's letters can show gaps, but has to count as complete in the regard that it simply never contained anything except Paul's letters. The same is true for the gospel majuscles with regards to their completeness.

Completeness of a majuscule is important (allegedly), but high age of the handwriting is more important; the most important are such parchment codices however, which excel by gapless completeness as well as their "age". If completeness means the text of the *entire* NT, then only 5 parchment codices attributed with a very high age are preserved. They are the five venerable majuscule Methuselahs that have already been mentioned earlier, but whose external as well as internal attributes must now be examined more in depth.

1. *Codex S (Sinaiticus*, or also Aleph), now in the British Museum, London:

Its discovery by *Tischendorf* in the year 1859 in the Catherine monastery on the Sinai has been described in the 3rd chapter, in connection with the comical incident caused by the forger *Simonides*. This majuscule handwriting is written in uncial, comprises the whole NT and the OT (today with large gaps), and it allegedly originates from the 4th century.

According to the discoverer, four scribes have worked on the manuscript, but the whole thing is written extraordinarily sloppily. Remarkable is how the simultaneously working scribes have divided their work. The one who wrote the whole NT has left seven sheets blank, namely the sheets 10, 15, 28, 29, 88, 91 and 126. These sheets were filled in by a different scribe. Soon after completion of the codex, or even still during the work, correctors have been at work, others have still made efforts for improvement in "later" centuries. *Tischendorf's*

claim that four scribes were involved in the writing-down, has been confirmed by another palaeographer (*Lake*). However, just how such claims of palaeographical "facts" are to be regarded, is clarified for us by the following message: *"Now that the handwriting can be thoroughly examined in the British Museum, the study of the corrections has begun anew..., Milne and Skeat prove to a high degree of probability that not four, but only three actual scribes were involved. Less secure is their claim, that furthermore, the number of correctors does not amount to 9, but only 2, and that those two are identical with two of the original scribes."*⁴²

Palaeographical determinations are difficult and remain uncertain [no kidding], even experts admit that much. However, it is not perhaps the high age of Codex S that is questioned, because it has of course been written in an uncial of the 4th/5th century. But no matter how antique a writing appears to be, this proves nothing by itself, because skilled graphic artists know how to mimic the most egregious writing as well. In such cases then, we are grateful when the handwriting shows other attributes which simplify the age determination, as is fortunately the case with the Sinaiticus. The church history writer Eusebius of Caesarea who has supposedly died in 340 allegedly introduced a division of the gospels into numbered segments (sections). In the Sinaiticus as well now, the gospels show the section numbers in the margins, by the hand of a corrector, that is. *"Since they are not found on two of the pages written by the ("contemporary") corrector Alepha, the entry of those numbers must have occurred only a short time after the creation of the handwriting. Thus, the time of origin can hardly be assumed to be before the 2nd quarter of the 4th century."*⁴³ We need not even think about why no corrector has completed the missing section numbers, because this numbering by itself does not prove authenticity and age of the codex S, either; incorporating such cosmetics is also part of the simplest practices of the forgery trade.

Which view do the palaeographers represent on the Sinaiticus' *place of origin*? Where the Sinaiticus was written "*cannot be established with full certainty. Reasons have been presented for Caesarea, Rome and Southern Italy, but the main weight of the opinions seems to favour Egypt. Every detail of the text finds its equivalent in the Egyptian papyri.*"⁴⁴

Very attentively, we receive the following interesting message: *a tight relationship exists between the Sinaiticus and Codex B (Vaticanus) [which has] "the same age".* That is, the relationship does not only extend to the peculiarities of the wording, but also to the writing! The discoverer of the Sinaiticus had already noticed the resemblance of the writing. *Tischendorf* had claimed that one of the scribes of the Sinaiticus (S) is identical with the scribe who wrote the NT in the codex Vaticanus (B). Although this opinion has been generally rejected, there is still enough left over in terms of attributes of resemblance nonetheless. Let us hear *Kenyon* on this point: "*Lake points out similarities in the head lines in the Acts in S and B from which it can be concluded that both [S and B] were produced in the same office.*"⁴⁵ As we will see a little later, we have good cause to remember this: *two of the five majuscule Methuselahs have first seen the light of tradition in the same office*, which latter was most likely situated in Egypt, supposedly!

2. Codex B (Vaticanus), in the Vatican library to Rome:

It stems from the 4th century, is produced in uncial writing, and comprises the OT and the NT, the latter with gaps. This script has been written by three or four scribes, but equally as flightily as the Sinaiticus. In the NT, one scribe often omits entire words, or he repeats words and letters. Two correctors have been at work one of whom was a contemporary of the scribes. This venerable majuscule has had bad luck with its ink: namely, at some time it had faded that badly that a "late hand" – according to the Roman publishers, a monk of the 15th century – has re-drawn almost all old letters with fresh ink! With the exception of those

letters he deemed wrong. During this general overhaul, it happened that "*at times, the old letters have not been accurately re-drawn, but have been replaced by others.*"⁴⁶

Regarding the date of B's creation, the palaeographers point out that the sections of Eusebius do not yet appear, which would thus supposedly suggest a very early time of manufacture. The extraordinary simplicity of the writing, too, as well as the layout in three columns, must testify to a high age, according to the experts' view.

With interest, we read *Kenyon's* following messages, reporting a remarkable shyness at officially publishing the wording of the Vatican codex: "*In 1669, 1720 and 1780, comparisons were undertaken by various scholars, but none of those works was published. Hug has aroused attention for their significance when it (the script) had been brought to Paris by Napoleon; but after their return to Italy, the Vatican authorities themselves were planning a publication, and they refused entry to foreign scholars; of course, waiting for this publication was in vain. Cardinal Mai who was indeed entrusted with the work, carried the latter out with such imperfection, so that it was withheld until the end of his life, and the two editions which have been published after his death, in 1857 and in 1859, deviated from each other so much that they could not be relied upon... Eventually, the New Testament was published by Vercellone and Cozzy in 1868, followed by the OT in 1881.*"⁴⁷

With regards to the potential *place* of B's creation, we remember the circumstance of B showing great resemblance with S concerning the character of the writing, which points to the same birth place of the two handwritings. Since in some chapters of the Vaticanus – equally as in the Sinaiticus – so-called Coptic forms of writing are found, then from this side as well, Egypt is suggested to be the "land of origin". B has been present in the Vatican library certainly as early as 1481.

3. Codex A ("Alexandrinus"), in the British Museum:

It stems allegedly from the beginning of the 5th century and contains both Testaments almost completely. (In the year 1621, the patriarch of Alexandria, Cyrill Lucar, has offered this handwriting to the British envoy Thomas Roe as a gift for Jacob I.) In its nowadays state, the codex shows gaps: so, almost the entire gospel of Matthew is missing. Five scribes have been working, and naturally, several correctors have also found employment, because we must hear this time as well: *"The scribe has... committed mistakes..., repetitions and omissions... in large numbers, he must have performed his work very thoughtlessly, and must have been fairly uneducated."*⁴⁸ ^{XX}

Since A does not only contain the Eusebius sections, but tractates by Eusebius and also Athanasius (who has allegedly died in 373), a temporal placement *before* the end of the 4th century is no longer possible. In line with this, palaeographers perceive that the script *"represents a later type than that of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. It is heavier and more firm [orig.: 'fest'], and shows less of the influence of the papyrus writing."*⁴⁹ ^{XXI} As mentioned before, palaeographical determinations are for the best part a matter of perception!

And what do the palaeographers reckon with regards to the *place* of A's creation? There is unanimity that all indications point to Egypt.

XX This is another one of those statements that holds no water in real life; there were plenty already, virtually in each of the quotations, and there will of course be more. Anyway, back then, being able to write meant to *be* educated – in a great many ways at least. A "fairly uneducated" person (of the numb-nut brand suggested here) would never have been entrusted with such work in the first place, for crying out loud.

XXI This last sentence, beginning with 'In line...', is *one* mess in this German language PDF copy. It is faulty grammatically, and Kammeier would never have written it like this. So, it's probably another case of 'AI is as AI does', and the scanner has garbled up the beginning of the quotation, leaving me to hope that I have translated this mess in Kammeier's sense.

4. *Codex C ("Ephraemi")*, in Paris

This majuscule stems allegedly from the 5th century, is written in uncial, and once also contained both OT and NT, but shows large gaps today. *Codex C* is a palimpsest, i.e. a handwriting whose parchment has been written on twice (on top of each other). Here, the original writing containing the biblical text had been washed off (washed over) during the 12th century, and in its place, works by Ephraem Syrus have been written. Thus, it now takes great pains to decipher the washed-over bottom writing, and this is not successful everywhere, so that codex C does not possess the great eminence of S and B. For the time of creation again, not so much the character of the writing is prevalent as is the fact that the written sections of Eusebius can be found in the margins. Since the script consists of "heavy uncial", and is "not dissimilar" to that of the codex Alexandrinus, palaeographers conclude: C belongs to the same time as A, and for C as well, Egypt can be assumed to be the *place* of creation. In the 16th century, the handwriting belonged to the Medici family.

5. *Codex D ("Bezae")*, in Cambridge (for that reason also called Cantabrigiensis):

It allegedly stems from the 5th century. Today, the script comprises, albeit with gaps, only the gospels and the Acts, as well as a fragment of the catholic letters in Greek and Latin. Originally forming a unit together with D was another handwriting, *Claramontanus (D2)*, which latter contains the in the *Cantabrigiensis* missing letters of Paul also in Greek-Latin. Nine scribes were supposedly working on codex D, and almost as many correctors have then been taking care of improvements. "*It can be seen at first glance how carelessly our codex is written.*"⁵⁰ One scribe for example has often written something wrong at first, but afterwards, still has written what was correct, "*without erasing the wrong things, and as a result, something nonsensical comes out, mentally.*" Remarkable are the "*quite arbitrary changes of expression for which no motif can be conceived at all.*" Indeed, D is the most wondrous of the

five parchment Methuselahs; later on however, we will have to wonder still more over its text.

"Dating the writing is very difficult, since it is different from that which we usually find on the parchment uncial."⁵¹ At any rate, the codex was written in the *West*; there is no agreement on the *place*, suggestions name Egypt, North Africa, Sicily.

It is superfluous to list further Greek handwritings, because the later majuscules and still later minuscules are only collectively significant for the problem which will occupy us in the next chapter. The *translations* also need to be dealt with only in brief.

Early Latin translations allegedly exist from 150 onwards, in text forms manifoldly deviating from each other, that is. One form which has probably formed in *Africa* is distinguished from one that has potentially formed in Southern Gaul. Of this African form, it can be said that on the one hand, it does not fully correspond with the text of D, but is on the other hand very closely related [to it].⁵² Of these early Latiners (*Vetus Latina*), there are still 44 handwritings extant, if the smallest fragments are included. "26 contain gospel texts, 9 each of *Acts* and *Paulines* [guessing at: letters of Paul], 5 remainders of the catholic letters, 3 apocalypse texts."⁵³ So, there is no script preserved containing the *entire* NT! The oldest specimen allegedly stem from the 4th century, the most recent still from the 12th and 13th century.

In the meantime – according to the tradition, allegedly decreed by pope Damasus in the year 382 – an official Latin newly translation has been produced by Hieronymus. This is the text form known by the name *Vulgata*, under which name it has later achieved autocracy in the Roman church. Remarkable is that from the first two centuries after its creation, there is no *Vulgata* handwriting preserved; even from the 6th to the 9th century, only 16 important specimen are counted.

Also important are two *old* Syrian gospel handwritings. The first – named *Curetonian Syrian* after its discoverer – has been dug up in 1842 in a monastery in the Natrun desert, and stems allegedly from the 5th century. Two English ladies, Levis and Gibson^{XXII}, found the second codex in a Catherine monastery by the Sinai. It is therefore called the *Sinai Syrian*. This is where *Tischendorf* discovered the *Sinaiticus* several years before as well!

Both Syrians are textually closely related to each other, although there are considerable deviations as well. One small but highly interesting text variant in Matthew 1,16 lends this translation a particular significance. Else, while the wording of this place in Matthew in general says: "[...] Jacob begot Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ" – here, we read: "Joseph... begot Jesus who is called Christ." Quite open-heartedly and in all clarity, the dogma of the virgin birth is rejected, and Jesus' uniquely human origin emphasised. When only could it have been desired to get one's hands on such "age-old" biblical testimony for the natural conception of the alleged founder of the christian religion? By chance, the early Syrians have been discovered just at the right moment: namely back then, one hundred years ago, when there was a strong desire for a textual confirmation of the "liberal" Jesus image.

Whilst the early Syrian translations have supposedly been created roughly simultaneously with the early Latin ones, a new Syrian translation, later than the Vulgata, then stepped forward as well: the *Peschita*. Several of the preserved scripts bring the gospels, but none contain the *whole* NT.

The above list as well as the description of the most important "old" Greek and miscellaneous handwritings of the NT is primarily meant to inform on the current state of the preservation. However, we have thus also procured the necessary codex material, in order to

XXII Levis is now an *English* name? This little story is just too silly for words.

gain from it a new general problem for our critique. In the following chapter, there will be opportunity to yet again observe "chance" performing a handwriting stroke of genius.

VIII. Show pieces of chance

When examining the overall stock of the preserved handwritings of the Greek NT (including the Latin and Syrian translations) by slowly looking back across the centuries, we note a quite natural phenomenon: the more we turn to the earlier centuries, the rarer the handwritings become. Facing the 2400 minuscules of the 15th back to the 9th century are only 232 majuscules from the 9th century back. *K Aland* who is commissioned with the maintenance of the official list of the (Greek) handwritings, comments on this: "*For the 8th to the 5th century, we know around 25 parchment handwritings for each century..., for the 4th century, we know 19, for the 3rd century even only 2; because this is where the tradition of the NT on parchment stops, and the one on papyrus sets in.*"⁵⁴ And of the 68 papyri, 17 are supposed to stem from the 2nd and 3rd century, and 19 from the 4th century.

The earlier, the rarer the preserved codices; this is, as mentioned, a quite natural phenomenon. So, what particular problems could potentially be encountered here? Why still ponder over the natural progression of these things? At any rate, expert science finds the affair in order, and apparently fully justified, presents the workings of *chance* as the very best explanation. Here indeed, chance deserves to speak up, make way for chance! Let us see how chance has carried out its work. Let us not forget however, that the genuine, real, natural chance is no worker-by-schedule, no systematician, but that it, in line with its nature, must simply work "by chance" [i.e. randomly]. We have therefore good cause to attentively

observe this magician during his operation in the realm of the preservation of the parchment handwritings of the NT, in particular the majuscules.

Beforehand, we must inform ourselves how "New Testament" is defined, and since when New Testaments have supposedly existed. What is meant by NT is a certain number of individual christian writings making up a fixed entity. Assuming that the history of the early christian literature and church were genuine and true tradition, then at very first, there should have been a time during which individual partial writings (gospels, letters etc.) were separately circulating in the christian communities. Exactly when certain writings have been joined to a whole, and exactly which authority was responsible for joining them – all that remains in the dark. Not even gaining clarification over a pre-problem – why does the *NT* contain *four* gospels, and not only one?^{XXIII} – has been successful. We will at a later time very thoroughly negotiate on the subject of the new-testamentarian canon; in connection with this, the information shall suffice [for now] that as early as in 300, collections have supposedly existed everywhere in the christian communities, comprising almost all writings the way they are presented in the NT. The four gospels, the Acts and the letters of Paul are already found in the "very first" collections of the NT as unconditionally necessary content. Every devout Christian who could afford it, and of course primarily the management of the communities had to strive for possessing *a complete* NT. (For the early centuries, we do not want to exaggerate the demand for completeness, and even accept those codices as complete "New Testaments" where originally only the basic stock was present – four gospels, Acts, letters of Paul – but the apocalypse or one of the catholic letters were missing.)

So, assuming that the christian-literary tradition of the first ten centuries were real and true, then at least from the 3rd century onwards, there should an ever faster rising flood of parchment codices of the NT have come into being. Under such circumstances, which

XXIII A just question, my liege.

Christian would have been still satisfied with this or that new-testamentarian writing – perhaps only one or two gospels, or only some of Paul's letters – when constantly in the divine service, Jesus' words or deeds were quoted from other "canonical" books not being available to them?

Back then however, were laymen even capable of reading? Or was the lecture of the NT even forbidden to them. Let us hear what "real" history sources have to tell us about this: *"Eusebius already talks of many thousand^{XXIV} women and men engaging in bible-reading... the hl. Chrysostomus has truly not told a lie to the people, since he accepts no excuse from even the poorest for not having the bible in their hands and houses..., that a bible was readily available and could be bought...and (one) could at least procure the new testament... Gregorius M. reassures us of a sufficient stock of the handwritten bibles... Caesarius, bishop of Arles, excuses nobody who does not possess this book of books."*⁵⁵ Still so many voices from the tradition could be referenced to prove that from the 3rd/4th century onwards, there could truly not have been any shortage of "bibles", i.e. at least complete collections of the NT – if it were only true what is written on the formation and dissemination in the first ten centuries. And that Christianity of those centuries would have everywhere regarded this book with reverence and possibly protected it from destruction, goes quite without saying, and is also often enough emphasised in the tradition itself. What would thus follow from the above under the assumption of the authenticity of the old church history? That from the 3rd/4th century to the 10th century, there could not have been any shortage of Greek majuscule codices of the *complete* NT or even entire bibles (OT and NT); equally of Latin, Syrian a.o. specimen of the *complete* NT.

XXIV Many thousand? Not perhaps millions? Surely, the place must have been crawling with them, no? And a little later, there were probably caves and church library warehouses stuffed to the brim with NTs waiting to be hauled off by the countless book dealers with their oxen or camel trucks. Jeepers, if it's not 'the style' again...

We are now prepared to receive the full brunt of the particular problem of this chapter, and to also directly dispatch it. This is about the scrutinisation of the overall stock of the preserved new-testamentarian handwritings. Initially, we pointed to a quite natural phenomenon: the earlier, the rarer the preserved remains. But then, we were shouting: caution! Let us yet have a look how *chance* has been working regarding the preservation of old parchments. On the whole, *just what has allegedly been preserved "by chance" from the 3rd to the 10th century?* That is, in terms of handwritings of the complete (*originally complete!*) new testament? Have perhaps even entire full bibles (i.e. with the OT and NT) been lucky to make it through to our times by chance?

No sensible person will expect that old parchment volumes have, without exception, come upon posterity completely unharmed and without gaps. Because even books experience their individual, often cruel fate. Thus, it makes no wonder that we have heard that so many biblical handwritings have been preserved badly mutilated, and for the best part, only as individual sheets and fragments. On the other hand, we have not forgotten that indeed entire handwritings of the new testament, even the entire bible – albeit with more or less large gaps – have supposedly defied the destructive tooth of time: e.g. those five venerable majuscule Methuselahs. Everything depends – or allegedly depended – on *chance*, and at last, it is high time to have ourselves told just exactly how this "chance" has operated during its selection.

In 1923, *R Knopf* has summarised: "*Of 168 (Greek) majuscule witnesses, there are 4 that were at least in their original form "pandects" [i.e. complete specimen of the entire bible; K.], of the around 2400 minuscules only 46.*"⁵⁶ This summary – still valid today with regards to the majuscules – sounds quite harmless and entirely natural in its presented formulation: it could be argued that this is simply how chance has worked it out. We are of course interested predominantly in the majuscules allegedly stemming from the 3rd/4th

century. And of course, we do not expect it to be reported that very many specimen of the *complete bible* are preserved, although there should be – with the workings of a real, natural chance – relatively many preserved parchment codices of the *complete* NT (albeit with gaps) in existence. How do things stand with the preserved stock in that regard?

Let us begin with the *translations*. *None* of the preserved handwritings of the two *Syrian* translations originally comprised the *whole* NT. It goes without saying that today, gaps are present everywhere; but the original inventory is crucial. Although in many cases, the later *Peschita* codices represent collections of the gospels as well, there have nonetheless no *Peschita* handwritings been descended upon us that would have ever comprised the whole NT. Yet, in Syria as much as elsewhere in the christian world from the 4th century onwards, there should have been ever fewer new-testamentarian partial collections (such as separate gospels, or manuscripts of Paul's letters), and ever more complete specimen of the whole NT. Right across all centuries however, no originally complete specimen (of course damaged today) of a Syrian NT is preserved. Can this be attributed to chance, the reader thinks? Well, although it is quite a tall order for us, we want to let it go as the workings of genuine chance.

Let us turn to the *early Latiners*. Of the allegedly from the 4th to the 9th century originating important *Itala* codices, all show to have originally been partial collections (by majority, they are gospel handwritings); here as well, a specimen of the (originally) complete *whole* NT has peculiarly not been preserved! Again, real chance?

But now, the *Greek* majuscule codices; how do things stand with these hand-downs? Why, the five parchment oldies count among them; and we remember immediately: these "age-old" codices – for this, we take the codices D and D2 as a unit originally – indeed present themselves as specimen with the *complete* NT. Must in this case our mistrust against chance not vanish? Is good old, honest chance not presenting itself from its best, most natural

side? Thus, everything seems to be in the best of order, does it not? Appearances are deceptive however, and we do well now if we just have a closer look over chance's shoulder. Let us set a trap for it, and see whether it perhaps takes the bait.

We again focus our attention on the 232 Greek *majuscules*. Among them are five specimen of the whole NT. Real chance *could* have been at work here; but in that case, chance should have *randomly spread* these five parchment volumes *across the most varying centuries*, i.e. one of these handwritings should perhaps be from the 4th, one or two from the 4th/5th century, another perhaps from the 7th century, and the last perhaps from the 8th century. At any rate, chance should have operated *blindly*, and since of course ever more bibles with a complete NT have come into the community as time progressed, more complete specimen from the later centuries than from early times should be preserved "by chance" as a result, had things progressed *naturally*. But out with them now – the surprising facts of the matter which the reader already knows anyway: the five complete parchment codices by no means stem from the late times; according to their alleged creation, they do not randomly originate from the varying centuries, either; much rather, chance has operated so skilfully, so that as *complete* specimen of the NT, *the oldest* majuscules have been preserved, *of all things*! Hats off to this chance! But with such systematic, glorious performance, it has itself torn the mask off its face. With this amazing work of selection, it reveals that it is not the genuine, natural chance, but that behind its mask, there is a clever worker-by-schedule hiding and acting. Namely, he has acted with deliberation, this our Mr Chance. He said to himself: biblical handwritings possess a particular value (for the biblical text) only, if they offer a complete as possible NT; their value as text witnesses exceedingly increases with their age however. Therefore, the "complete ones" must be as old as possible, namely then do they fairly well replace the "unfortunately lost" apostolic originals. And from old – even as early as the 14th/15th century, the church needed such biblical pseudo-originals, since Christianity

simply is a history and book religion. So, chance has shown mercy, and of all majuscules – with one exception – had just the oldest descend upon posterity as complete specimen.

The exception – it is this the *codex Laurensis*, allegedly from the 8th/9th century – can of course not rehabilitate the unmasked "chance", it is trapped. Nonetheless, it defends itself and screams: I am, well and truly, blind chance! But all kicking does this fellow no good, because we have him fully un-masked instantly, because behold: *especially these four oldest* majuscule volumes *are the only* handwritings preserved as *complete bibles*, i.e. next to the complete NT, comprising the OT as well. Over this fact, we can still only wonder and stammer: what a sensible Mr Chance!

The story becomes ever more interesting however. From the protocol of the findings about the five oldest majuscules, we are now in a position to reference yet more evidence for chance's secret work-by-plan, and ask the reader to look up, what has earlier been reported on the location of origin of these codices. We heard so much there which now, presents itself to us in an entirely new light: for "chance" has yet arranged it so, that all five preserved complete volumes supposedly first saw the light of an office in the blessed land of Egypt. The two oldest ones even appear to stem from the same office. And with this, enough of the plan of operation of alleged chance. If we now look over the in this chapter listed show pieces in context, they thus assemble as links to a chain. A uniform action reveals itself that no longer has anything to do with chance, but has been thought up and controlled by a secret entity.

No matter from which side the phenomena of the handwritten tradition of the NT are approached, time and again, a critical view of the given results shows that the big "globe of the tradition" has been "turned" by a powerful association of learned history correctors. Although, things have to be viewed from sufficient height in order to be able to spot the essentials; in a manner of speaking, we have to take mental aerial shots in order to even

notice certain veiled problems. Despite biblical parchmentology zealously studying these scripts for a hundred years, it has up to this day not occurred to them that the existence of the oldest majuscules in their particularity as only representatives of preserved complete bibles carries an interesting central problem. From the theologians' viewpoint, they can of course not feel too edified, when objective facts of the tradition suddenly prove to be problematic and – upon consequent critique – even artificially generated. In the case of those five oldest biblical parchment volumes, it is also not about insignificant or peripheral things, but about the core and centre of the biblical handwriting tradition, namely the replacement-originals of the apostles' and evangelists' writings, and thus the written foundation of the accreditation material of the christian religion as such.

IX. The mystery of the new-testamentarian text variants

So far, we have inspected the handwritten tradition of the new testament with a view to the external fate of the codices. There, as the final result of detailed scrutinisation, the realisation has been gained: the external preservation histories of biblical handwritings cannot be accepted as naturally generated and naturally progressing events, but have to be rated artificially generated phenomena.

However, the handwritten tradition of the new-testamentarian books also reveals to us an *inner* history, referring to the fate of the *texts* of these books. It is a by thousandfold experience proven fact that the wording of an old work – especially when in times before the invention of the printing press, their reproduction was done by hand – can suffer all sorts of changes. Erring is human even during writing or copying, and it makes no difference whether

worldly or clerical texts are concerned. When we thus hear that the wording of the new-testamentarian scripts is not uniformly handed down, but that instead, numerous deviations are found in each of the four gospels and in the Acts, we are happy to concede that such phenomenon *can* be quite natural. Whether such facts really *are* natural however, whether they can be certified as having formed naturally in this (new-testamentarian) case, is not certain a priori, but has to be decided by a critical [criminal!] investigation first. Of the five main majuscules we know how sloppily the scribes performed their task. We have also heard on the other hand, that the mash-up of the wording was by no means a matter of indifference to the "old" order givers, because always, correctors set to work immediately in order to reinstate the accuracy of the holy text. This is primarily about the *Greek* text, because as is well-known, all new-testamentarian books have "originally" been written in the Greek language.

From old, the greatest efforts have been made to find out the "genuine" wording of for example Luke's gospel, by comparison of the text especially in the "oldest" handwritings. Here, 'genuine' means 'original', i.e. in the version in which the supposed gospel writers put their words and sentences on paper. However, the more codices were compared, the greater grew the embarrassment of the philologists: they had yet not expected quite so many text differences (variants)! In 1906, *A Pott* reports on the amount of text variants for the entire NT: "*As early as 1707, Mill counted 30000 of them; in 1887, the estimate was 150000; and today, I am certainly not estimating too high in assuming 200000.*" *Pott* then continues: "*By quite a rough estimate, the text of the Greek NT should perhaps... comprise 150000 words. Thus, for each 3 words, there would always be 4 different ones to chose from, throughout the book.*"⁵⁷ According to this, a gigantic confusion with regards to the wording of the holy scripture is the rule; yet, the affair is not anywhere near as bad as the referenced high numbers seem to suggest. There are many spelling mistakes [also called 'clerical' errors, of all

things!] which are obvious as such, and which do not touch the meaning of the relevant word. Also belonging to those are countless orthographic variants (which can in part have been introduced deliberately as well) such as Isac or Isaac, John or Jon, or reversals such as Jesus Christ and Christ Jesus. More than anything, there is still this following particular difficulty: the "oldest" majuscules – i.e. the five standard codices as well – are written in so-called connected writing, i.e. the Greek uncial letters have been drawn up without a space after words, and still mostly without punctuation as well, i.e. in a "never-ending" row of letters without spaces. With such uninterrupted stream of letters, reading and copying of the biblical books were a taxing occupation, and there certainly lay a rich source of errors and variants in this, which could also effect the semantics of words and sentences. Because although the new-testamentarian variants may well be semantically irrelevant for the largest part, in all gospels and the remaining writings of the NT however, we yet encounter certain cases of semantic differences that are by no means harmless anymore. They much rather effect *important semantic changes*, why, they often give many significant places in the bible a downright contrary meaning!

Semantic-changing variants? Serious differences in the wording? How could such momentous text changes, often consisting of additions or omissions of entire words and sentences, make their way into the codices? Can even such cases still be dismissed as errors of flightily working or uneducated scribes? This problem will soon keep us intensely busy; just this much for now: even among theologian critics, there is no doubt that *certain variants* have been introduced to the text *in full deliberation*. These "certain" cases are referred to, when there is mention of new-testamentarian text variants in the title of this chapter.

The fact that the many preserved handwritings of the NT do not present the wording uniformly corresponding, but instead, in many variants, often with strongly changed

meaning, must have an unsettling effect much less on the researching theologian than on the simple, devout Christian; on the premise that this latter Christian even ponders over something which has probably become mostly known to him by indications [if by anything at all]. Why of course should they rack their brains over text differences, since the bible in their possession offers a quite unique wording which has been fixed for centuries. If they are perhaps referring to the Lutheran bible, they console themselves with the thought that surely, the German translation yet corresponds as accurately as even possible with the unique Greek "primeval text" upon which it is based. However, it will not at all rise to the layman's consciousness, that only by the Greek copy and voucher presumed by them the actual difficulty appears in the first place. The alleged history of the handwriting tradition has of course already patronised us that as early as the 4th century, primeval script of the gospels was no longer in existence; now we hear of a [biblical] flood of variants. *From where does or did suddenly a "fixed" text come at the beginning of the Modern Age? And what is the guarantee that a certain fixed text is the genuine, i.e. the original one, too?* In the face of the countless differences in wording, this question rightfully pushes to the foreground.

Who gave Luther a guarantee for the authenticity and the primeval character of his Greek copies? Luther put his trust into the famous scholar Erasmus who in 1516, has arranged for a printed, critical edition of the NT. Erasmus has performed what was possible in his time; he was of course depending on the copies accessible to him for the text comparison, and for the largest part back then, those were the *more recent minuscules*. With textual regard, this type of handwritings excels by a remarkable kinsmanship: they share striking variants, which latter are not found elsewhere. Standing closely next to this family of texts is the allegedly from the beginning of the 5th century stemming *codex Alexandrinus* (A). We will bring a small variant example: in Matthew's gospel (10,3), both "age-old" S and

B name a Thaddaeus; in Thaddaeus's place, codex D names a Lebbaeus; codex A skilfully summarises here and reads: Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus.

Viewed on the overall whole of course, these name differences may not carry much momentum; but this example, so modestly presenting itself, reveals essentials with lightning brightness, it gives us deep insight into the dark secrets of the new-testamentarian complex of variants. This variant which reads: *the entirety of all new-testamentarian variants breaks forth into three big streams*, indeed teaches us the most significant realisation in the realm of biblical text critique; under the critical view of the philologist, the seemingly incalculable muddle of variants sorts itself into three big groups, each of which showing characteristic peculiarities, thus rightfully claiming to be viewed as text families. From our example, we now also learn something *fundamental on the kinsmanlike connections* of the four (five) textual "primeval ancestors" [orig.: 'Urahen'] of all handwritings. Much like with the name of one of the apostles in this case, elsewhere as well, *the codices S and B mostly stick together against A and against D*. (The fifth of the "age-old" handwritings, codex C, enjoys leaning towards A.)

As early as around 1800, *Johann Jacob Griesbach* distinguished three types of handwritings on the basis of textual peculiarities: the Occidental, Alexandrian, Konstantinopolitan ones. In more recent times, the English researchers *Westcott* and *Hort* have zealously performed reconnaissance work amongst the handwritings: as a result, they also arrived at the assumption of three (or 4, respectively) groups of texts in 1881 – the Antiochian-Syrian, the Western (Occidental), the so-called neutral group, and still in addition, the Alexandrian sub-group. According to the researchers' view, the text of group 1 is present in the overwhelming majority of the preserved Greek handwritings. Next to the early Latin translations, codex D presents the "Western" text. The main representatives of the

neutral text are the famous uncials S and B, whilst principle witnesses for the Alexandrian sup-group do not exist; for this group, codices A and C could potentially be considered first, according to *Westcott* and *Hort*. They rate the neutral family as the most important and most trustworthy representation. Not only are (allegedly) their witnesses S and B "very old", but they have also almost purely preserved the "original" wording. Should thus really the so hotly pursued desired goal be reached by the philologian researchers: the rediscovery of the original, genuine wording of the new-testamentarian books? That would equate to a true miracle. Consider this: the variants factually count in the hundreds of thousands – and two so extraordinarily carelessly written codices such as the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus, of all things, supposedly give the text almost in purity!? In addition, both must have been copied from copies which latter would have been almost free of variants themselves.

The great trust which *Westcott* and *Hort* have put into the "neutral" text family, has thus of course not remained untouched for very long in expert circles. The by codex D represented group, so explicitly neglected by the Englishmen, has renewed its significance again. Anew, the text critic *H von Soden* set out to do the reconnaissance work, the results of which are interesting to us at this point only in so far as again, three text families were established. The basic concepts of this researcher were not overwhelmingly echoed, either; this is easily understandable, because according to how things are simply standing, agreement on the question of the variants can in principle not be reached. Only the *one* result, at the same time the most important as well, may count as certain: that all preserved handwritings, with regards to their text, are separated into *three main groups*, at the top of which rank the known "age-old" parchment majuscules. From this viewpoint, our earlier mentioned little variant example with the tottering apostle name gains utmost significance, because it already contains in its nucleus the chief realisation of the existence of three text families.

So far, we have merely been looking for information in the new-testamentarian variant district, based upon the arbitrary premise that the in the handwritings met "development" phenomena of the text have formed in a natural fashion over the course of centuries. Now is the time to no longer merely take note, but to critically view that which is given. As always, i.e. in the variant complex as well, we assess the small and smallest when it is worth doing, but we do not get caught on the ground in the shrubs; instead, we choose our viewpoint high enough, so that the great contours, the essential context, become visible.

So, let us now critically view the quite essential fact of the *three text streams*. Allegedly *when* did the separation of the handwritings into three different main groups occur? Surprisingly, this has happened quite early already, namely according to the "facts" of the tradition, *as early as in the 4th century!* Why, the "age-old" parchment volumes, so well known to us, are witnesses for such early and insistent three-way split of the biblical wording. These codices S and B, A and C, and D function as the primeval ancestors of the three long handwriting generations. S and B allegedly originate from as early as the 4th century of course; *thus, even as early as back then, the main differences in the text had been firmly established!* The described situation in the 4th/5th century not only represents the highpoint in the process of the "deliberate" variant formation, but it also marks an end. Namely, in the "further development" of the text, a remarkable quiet sets in over the variant business. Certainly, the copyists continue blundering, and have to be corrected a lot; the big characteristic deviations from the "early times" are faithfully dragged along as well. However, the fertile period of the radical *arbitrary semantic changes* of the wording is coming to an end. New text families do not form any longer, why, two of the old main streams begin flowing quite sparingly. All the more does the third clan prove to be exceedingly fertile now, because by far the most minuscules turn out to be the offspring of the by *Kenyon* denoted "Byzantine" family *a* which latter then represents the dominion-

achieving clerical text (Textus Receptus). When theologists praise: the *handwritten tradition of the New Testament is not only extraordinarily large, but it is also extraordinarily good*",⁵⁸ then that may be true, but with the restriction that those "certain" main variants from the "early times" have zealously and faithfully been co-disseminated, i.e. the much praised excellence of the tradition worryingly extends to the first deep semantic changes as well.

All painstaking attempts at advancing to the supposed original wording of the NT have failed. All that could be achieved by the gigantic work of far-reaching, painfully accurate handwriting comparison culminates in the embarrassing realisation that with the existence of the five primeval ancestors, we actually possess *three very different "original" texts!* We now have a choice as to which of the three original text groups we would like to give our trust the most; this problem and its pseudo-solutions shall be treated later however. Instead, we do not want to neglect reporting of a result, which came about, in a manner of speaking, as a by-product of the comparison text examination. In doing so, we are awaiting the joy of once again observing "chance's" meaningful manipulations.

In the face of the existence of many handwritings of a work: when the philologist critique is in search of the original wording, they deploy the *genealogical* method. The researcher attempts setting up a family tree of the handwritings (copies), in order to highlight their relations and circumstances of origin. Looking backwards then, they can overlook the entire succession of the copies' family tree, and recognise which relevant specimen have been used as *templates* for others. This is how things have panned out, if natural factors were at work, i.e. if a "family tree" had not been artificially created.

The philologistian scrutinisation of the preserved Greek codices of the NT has also brought to light the remarkable situation now, that with this type of handwritings, a genealogical connection, real circumstances of origin, and thus family trees cannot even be

recognised. It means a unique stroke of luck, if a real dependency can be established in the new-testamentarian realm, such as is the case with the so-called Ferrar group. Here, four Greek minuscules reveal themselves to be copies of *one* original. Else however, the biblical handwritings behave like independent individuals, lacking all genuine genealogical connection throughout all the centuries. Even in cases where on one occasion, the kinsmanship of two codices becomes probable by certain peculiarities, stark differences in the text immediately render illusory the stemming of one handwriting from another, or from a shared original, respectively. Strikingly, only the membership to one of the three "age-old" text families can always be established! It is quite characterising for the situation *of so few family trees*, that especially in the case of the "oldest" standard codices, it cannot be established with certainty, whether *direct* copies have ever been made. *Of all four* (five) handwritings, genuine *offspring* is missing! Should it have been in existence, then every trace of its parchment existence must have been erased "by chance". Yet again, we admire the accurate actions of chance; because as mentioned, across all the centuries, the preserved parchments stand there like orphans who have, nor had, parents (originals)! Besides vanishing exceptions, it is the originals *of all* existing Greek codices of the NT that have consistently perished. A peculiar fellow, this *consistent* Mr Chance! Of course, he can no longer fool us; we know who is sitting behind him controlling him; the purpose of the forgery association. In truth, those "perished" originals have never existed, and the preserved handwritings have indeed been smuggled into this world as isolated specimen.

X. The biblical text's fear of uniqueness

The majority of theologians of all denominations painfully regrets that not at least with the "historical" main parts of their religion, corresponding and unique reports of the evangelists exist, and that furthermore, the text of the relevant places is handed down in such variety. How dark and full of contradictions is for example the tradition of the institution of the holy communion; here, the confusion originates particularly from a Luke variant of the "Western" text. No acumen has yet managed to find out just what has to be rated the "original" statement on the events of the Lord's supper.

As mentioned, most theologians view such unclear situations with a sigh; but there have always been exegetes who looked deeper, and who, on the contrary, were glad over a certain murkiness of the text tradition, because they had realised the principle essence of this unclarity. The theologian members of the great falsification action at any rate, were wise and knew that, and why, even with the reports on baptism and Lord's supper, they had to necessarily operate with contradictions. Different to the majority of nowadays text interpreters, those theologian fictionists and thinkers felt a well-founded fear of clear, unique details in the gospels (that were to be conceptualised). Back then, they did not even have to look for contradictions; those came about all by themselves when they were setting out to give the idea of the christian redemption drama of the Jesus story a human appearance. The "historical reality" resulting from this showed contradicting^{XXV} portions everywhere in its structure. These dialectical tensions could not be eliminated in any way, because they represent essential elements of the "Christ event". Externally as well, planting the invented Jesus story into the ground of real history was bringing on all sorts of difficulties which were

XXV Orig.: 'antinomisch' which would, according to my library, suggest 'antinomian' [very roughly: rejecting ethical laws] as a translation; as it turns out on the next instance of this word however, it becomes obvious that Kammeier had in mind the meaning 'antithesis'/'antagonism', i.e. contradiction. (Well, can 'AI' do that?)

suggesting that it did not seem advisable to cause embarrassment by clearly naming places and names in questions regarding time and space. One choice remedy for getting rid of the manifoldly appearing difficulties consisted of blaming the text tradition for the existence of the contradictions. Here, the origin of the "deliberate" variants allegedly lay in the first centuries; and from the existence of the three big text families, we already know of course what comprehensive and well considered use has been made of this remedy.

We now descend from the general to the particular, in order to demonstrate by several examples, of what nature the variants are, which have been placed in the handed down text as deliberate semantic changes. Such modifications often penetrate the heart of the biblical salvation message. Two of the cases listed next demonstrate that even the two centre pieces of Christianity, the Lord's prayer and the Lord's supper, have not been spared from "corrections" of the semantic essence, i.e. they could not have been spared.

1. In general

Let us remember the in the previous chapter mentioned variant example of Matthew 10,3. Here, we will contemplate this example more thoroughly, in order to get an understanding of the trinity of the text families. As we have seen, there is confusion in the wording of Matthew 10,3 regarding a disciple's name. Should this insecurity be traceable back to the *author* of the gospel? This is hardly to be assumed seriously, since a primeval Christian who has of course supposedly written the Matthew gospel, has naturally been in the know on the names of the twelve who were Jesus' disciples. So, the evangelist put down the correct name. What is the "correct" name however? Was the relevant disciple's name now Thaddaeus or Lebbaeus? Guessing becomes even more difficult by the fact that the same insecurity as in Matthew 10,3 surfaces with another "primeval Christian", namely the alleged author of Mark's gospel. How

is something like that possible? On the one hand, the primeval Christians by all means had to know the correct name of the relevant disciple; then it remains quite inconceivable how later, during copying, there could have been any vagueness. On the other hand however, the "originals" must have already been not quite in order, because else, the copyists could not have caused such confusion. We are already sensing it: this is an artificial problem surfacing here! Let us leave aside the alleged evangelists, and focus all attention on the *copyists*, i.e. on the scribes of the five "oldest" parchment codices S, B, A, C and D.

In the Matthew verse, S and B name the disciple in question Thaddaeus; D hands down Lebbaeus instead; A mediates and reads: Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus. Three different sets of information are given; in line with the trinity of the "oldest" overall text. It does not perhaps go without saying however, that by the peculiarity of the text, the preserved handwritings separate into *three* groups. Why are there not more groups, why not a dozen? (It does not change a thing about the prevailing trinity, if some researchers want to establish one or two subfamilies in addition to the three main families.) So, why principally *three* text clans? Our thought process must be based on the assumption that the deliberately placed variants are meant to establish certain *contradictions*. In order to introduce contradictions however, (at least) *two* primeval codices, or (at least) *two* text groups, respectively, must necessarily be produced. If a deliberate contradiction shall not, or cannot be "suspended", i.e. if a real contradiction is meant to remain live, then two standard codices as the places of origin of two text families are sufficient. If no stark contradiction is desired, if much rather an oscillation of the statement is recommended – the way it is quite frequently the case in new-testamentarian thinking – then, still a *third* primeval codex (as the primeval ancestor of a third big text family) has to come into existence. Thus, the necessity of the existence of three big new-testamentarian text families is explained by the nature of the deliberate *contradiction*, embedded in the tradition with explicit purpose. Text differences

that are based on mere error (carelessness) of the copyists – i.e. they are not intentional – do not sort themselves into three separate groups, but fall apart into a multitude of unspecific classification, when frequently copied. If we now observe that indeed *three* main text families exist *with which all preserved handwritings can be associated*, then this phenomenon of systematic trinity cannot be the work of blind chance; then we may and must conclude: we are dealing with an *artificial problem*! Such planful trinity of the overall complex of the text proves in full obviousness the artificial origin (forgery) of the standard codices as well as that of their offspring until the time of the late medieval falsification action. (Then, *after* that action, copies could increasingly be produced in good faith in the authenticity of the originals.)

Our apparently so insipid variant example Matthew 10,3 with the tottering name of the disciple betrays to us the artificiality of the three-fold text tradition with baffling open-heartedness. Just imagine the situation in practice for a moment: three scribes (allegedly of the 4th/5th century) are busy producing handwritings of the NT. They work independently of each other, the one knows nothing of the others. They now arrive at Matthew 10,3, and here, for some dark reason, there is insecurity over a disciple's name. The scribes do not want to omit the name, so they have to decide to put one down (the one they deem correct). It would be a conspicuous coincidence – but at least a natural coincidence – if the *independently from each other working* copyists, all three of them, chose *the same* name (either all choose Thaddaeus, or they all choose Lebbaeus, or they all choose any other same name). It could also have been a whim of natural chance if the three scribes named three *different* names. Why, we even want to view it as natural chance if two copyist wrote down one name, and the third scribe another. It is *no longer natural chance* however, if a pattern, a principle reveals itself! The pattern is this: X–Y–XY [later on in the text, Kammeier uses a–b–ab]. *Utilisation* of this pattern does not occur mechanically or automatically; it assumes deliberate operation

with the contradiction and its suspension, i.e. cooperation. The three scribes must have made prior arrangements, they could *not* have set to work independently. However, a conference of the "old" copyists of the standard codices B, D and A is now not only improbable, but such meeting (or postal arrangement amongst them) is (assuming the authenticity of the tradition) impossible; because codex B came into being allegedly early in the 4th, codex A early in the 5th, and D at the end of the 5th century. Thus, the arrangement of the three copyists, revealing itself in the usage principle of the contradiction, is not conceivable by natural means. This means however, that the phenomenon is generated artificially; and this means that handwritings B, A and D have been manufactured in the same workshop, namely the workshop of the medieval forgery association. (Codex S, so as to support B, has been fabricated later, very probably as late as the 19th century.)

2. The Lord's prayer

From old, the Lord's prayer stands in the highest esteem as one of the most precious parts of the christian faith and life. Assuming that Jesus and the disciples had been historical figures, then without a doubt, this model prayer which the master taught his disciples, must have belonged to the most well-known and in its form fixed and uniformly handed down utterances of Jesus, at first in the circle of the closest followers, and soon after, in the "primevally christian" communities as well. Because the master, when he *taught* the prayer (pressed the disciples to memorise it), has *commanded*: in this manner, therefore, pray! There was thus no danger that over the course of the tradition, the Lord's prayer could experience changes from an insecurity over its wording, by for example "forgetting" the number of requests, or their consecutive order, respectively. Very soon allegedly, the wording was of

course fixed in writing by the evangelists, albeit only by Matthew and Luke. Peculiarly, the other two evangelists did not consider it necessary to relate the Lord's prayer.

So, the Lord's prayer, the 'our-father'^{XXVI}, has been handed down by Matthew (6,9-15) and Luke (11,1-4) If we now look up the text in the primeval codices, that is, the Matthew report first, we notice that all important handwritings – besides content-related insignificant trifles – correspond with each other in the text reproduction. Then we examine the primeval ancestors in the parallel verses of Luke's gospel, and encounter a monstrous fact: although the handwritings S, A, C D deliver the seven requests in exactly the same way they are given by Matthew, the allegedly oldest handwriting B, of all things, offers a Lord's prayer with – *only five requests!* In Luke in codex B, the *third* request ("Your will be done")^{XXVII} and the *seventh* request ("But deliver us from the evil one") are missing. Not enough of the surprise yet: another series of codices as well – such as the early Syrians - only knows the by two requests mutilated Lord's prayer!

The fact of these piercing variants must not merely be noted by us, it is screaming for an explanation. Just how could something like this have happened? Just how is it possible that the scribe of handwriting B (and the scribes of the early Syrian codices) could omit two requests? After all, the scribes were Christians who kept their Lord's prayer in their memories as well (and as correct) as their co-faithfuls. Even the theologist researchers agree that here, not an error, not a mistake of the copyists is involved. In that case however – on the assumption of a "natural" formation of the variants – only the one explanation remains, that the heavy mutilation had been effected by the copyists *on purpose*. And that explanation has the least use, it cannot even be taken seriously – namely when we have the affair unfold in

XXVI This is what this thing is called in German: 'Vaterunser'; it's just 'our' and 'father' reversed.

XXVII Don't anybody start nit-picking here (or at any later point): but it should be this or that instead, in this case 'thy will...' or something; I'm just quoting from *the single most contradictory book on Earth*, from one of the great many versions available in the English language alone...

the life of the primeval Christians, and observe it. What type of frenzied fellows must those scribes (or their customers) have been, that they could conceive changing the all-known prayer of the Lord after their own fancy. Had they nonetheless dared, they would, in real life, have been rejected with their mutilation by fellow Christians.

We can imagine, how the theologists have been desperately looking for a way out of this situation. Somehow, it *must* be possible to find an explanation for the mysterious behaviour of B's scribe. They then thought that after all, they had found a last way out, and that the existence of the variants could thus yet be conceived to be "natural". It was argued: the blame lay not with the copyists, but with the author of Luke's gospel. Assuming that Luke himself has deliberately shortened the prayer, then everything is in order and most well conceivable according to these critics. Really? Regarding this point, the theologist *Feine* comments in his book on Jesus: "*Concerning the Lord's prayer, the presumption is suggested that Luke, who has of course abridged oftentimes else as well, under the realisation that Jesus had wanted to formulate a brief prayer, viewed in the third and seventh request merely versions of the second and sixth request.*"⁵⁹ So, Luke has assumed (!) that Jesus had wanted (!); what Jesus has "really" said and taught, that in this case, he commanded *seven* requests – it is not authoritative for this devout evangelist! What the theologists impute a primeval Christian with this, does not only sound improbable, it is, viewed practically, flat impossible. In "real" life of primevally christian communities, nobody, not even Luke, would have had the nerve or impiousness to interpret or improve the prayer of the Lord, known by all the world in its "genuine, original" version. No matter which way this thing is being turned or twisted, whether the copyists or the evangelists are to be blamed for the shortening of the Lord's prayer, a *natural* explanation for the variants in Luke's gospel of codex B cannot be found. That means that the phenomenon has been created artificially, that is, the installation

of the text variants occurred already over the course of the falsification action, forced by theological considerations.

Under what force did the late medieval globe turners act, when in one of the main codices, they inserted the Lord's prayer in an abridged form? For what reason was for example the third request ("Your will be done") omitted? It is merely required to follow the thought process of the theologian for a little, in order to find the solution. The medieval authors of the gospels were wise and learned men who very soon recognised two stones of contention in the Lord's prayer. So the devout Christian, in their basic stance, will certainly agree with what God decides to be good for them; they will thus, with the request: *Your* will be done (not mine!) express that they are prepared to (in principle) submit to God's decisions. Such word of submission however, does not contain a real request, but it represents an avowal to obedience in God's will, which latter is put into practice in humanly unexplorable and unchangeable fashion. He who prays however, wants to not only give an avowal of submission; they do not merely want to pray, but politely ask, i.e. they want to move God *to grant* them something that lay close to their heart personally. If only ever God's will is to prevail, then presenting human requests can actually no longer make sense. The one, in its basic stance, rules out the other. But the pious Christian is permitted and required to also ask their God for the fulfilment of personal wishes: ask, and you will be given! Especially in Luke's gospel, this humane side is strongly emphasised in other places; urgently and constantly, we must storm the heavenly father with our desires according to Luke 11,6-8 and 18,1-8. Naturally, to the active stance, the passive tone of the third request stands in crass contradiction. (In practice, the simple praying person may "suspend" the contradiction by the fact that both viewpoints in turns dominate within them.) Consequently, in Luke's gospel – and only in this one gospel – the third request of the Lord's prayer with its emphasis on submission was cancelled for that reason. Clarity, uniqueness, should not and must not rule in

the question of the prayer, either; here, the fundamental dogmatic antithesis [see footnote 25], expressing itself in the peculiarly tottering position of the sinful human being towards God-the-father, had to be maintained by all means.

The cancellation of the *seventh request* "but deliver us from the evil one" appears superfluous at first glance, since here, as is conceivable, we are dealing with an active request, the fulfilment of a wish. Looking a little closer, it becomes clear that this request contains a theological obstacle. For one, in its demand, it comes out so very comprehensive, why, even universal (it is asked that god generally rid the world of everything bad and evil), that there can be hardly any talk of a real, active request. For another, this request concerns something (dogmatically) impossible, since of course for any Christian, bad and evil are inevitable collateral phenomena of human sinfulness during this world age.

Overlooking the Lord's prayer complex once again, it follows with certainty that the Luke variants have an artificial, theoretical origin. In practice, i.e. in real life of pious Christians back then, no entity would have dared cancel two requests from the all-known Lord's prayer.

3. The Lord's supper

Yet again, the gospel reports on the holy communion give the bible reader a tough mystery to solve. We may find that it is almost natural to constantly bump into new evidence for the fact that contradiction is an essential characteristic of the new-testamentarian world of thought, but at least in this case yet, where it really is about the centre piece of Christianity, we would like to meet clarity, uniqueness and correspondence in the reports. And indeed, to our surprise, two evangelists report the ongoing and Jesus words on the implementation of

the Lord's supper in textual correspondence. Matthew and Mark report: when Jesus celebrated the last passover with the twelve, that is, while they were eating, the master broke bread, shared it around and in doing so, spoke: take, eat; this is My body. Jesus then took the filled cup, and gave it to the disciples with the words: this is my blood, and all drank from it. Both reporters not only correspond regarding the events, but also in the "meaning" of bread and wine as Christ's body and blood. Before we turn to the Luke report, let us inquire with John. What does the fourth evangelist report? He remains silent, he does not report a word on the institution action!

John's silence on this highly important matter remains a mystery for all theologians. And what has not all been presented as an attempt of an explanation, in order to render conceivable, for what reason this author has remained silent on the Lord's supper. There is an old controversy: what actually was John driving at with his gospel? Did he want to merely complement the other gospels, or did he want to push them aside? Nobody will seriously consider the second option for the real life of the primeval Christians. Assuming John wanted to complement [the gospels]; so, he then omitted what has already been told by the synoptists. Is that the reason he also omitted the institution of the holy communion? But the complementing theory is not right; why, the fourth evangelist repeats for example the story of the first three authors about the feeding of the five thousand and of Jesus walking on water. Then why does he not also repeat a for the faith and cult so momentous fact as the institution of the Lord's supper? Some theologians believe that they have found the right explanation. They turn the tables, and reckon: John is right of course when he remains silent, because "originally", the other evangelists had reported nothing on a sacred institution of a meal, either, because such event had never occurred in the first place. Reports on the institution have been inserted into the first three gospels only later. In order to realise the haplessness of such argument – we only have to ask the "practical" question: then why have these stupid (!)

people not smuggled their report into the fourth gospel as well? John's silence is not a natural problem. What is hiding behind it however? The evangelist Luke sets the track for us, he tells us exactly where the theological obstacle lay in the story of the holy communion: it is about the *cup*!

In the 22nd chapter of his writing, Luke mentions the cup *twice*. Firstly in verse 17: according to this, Jesus, before the meal of passover, took the cup, said thanks and said: take this and divide it among yourselves. The most important thing is missing here: Jesus does not say a word on the "meaning" of the cup, which latter thus merely plays a part as a *farewell cup*. Secondly, in verse 20: according to this, the cup appears once again, but this time (like in Matthew and Mark), *as the Lord's supper* cup, with the interpreting words: this cup is the new covenant in my blood. This twofold emphasis on the cup appears remarkable, but it must have a valid reason. It is already striking that in none of the "old" standard codices – which have else truly not shown any shyness in terms of "corrections" – the "superfluous" mention of the first cup in Luke's gospel has been erased. The "Western" handwriting D, too, faithfully hands down verse 17 with the usual passover cup and farewell cup. We mention codex D for a good reason, namely because this handwriting serves us the very biggest surprise. The scribe of D erases something as well, but what? He *omits verse 20*, i.e. he carefreely omits the entire institution action including the interpreting words referring to the *holy communion cup*! This time, not even the most faithful text critic can assume sloppiness or inattentiveness of the copyist as the cause for the omission of these sentences that are so important to the faith. Without a doubt, contemplation and deliberation have been at work here. Deliberation of a copyist allegedly from the 4th century? Oh no! How could a pious, right faithful Christian of that time have gotten the idea of disfiguring Luke's everywhere known report on the Lord's supper by erasing – not perhaps the common passover cup!, but –

the holy cup? With such mutilated text, how could he have slipped through for even only one day!

There are historians who in all seriousness argue: if an event that is impossible per se, is reported by *multiple* authors, then there must be some truth to it. Behold: not only the scribe of D has dropped verse 20; some *early Latiners* did not mind passing over Luke's holy communion cup with silence, either. And yet another "copyist of the 5th century", far off in the Syrian land, had the "obvious" idea to amputate Luke's verse 20 because of irrelevance; he left verse 17 with the regular cup untouched! This is true for the *Curetonian Syrian*. The *Sinai Syrian*, allegedly from the 4th century, did not go as far; he was content to re-arrange the verses thus – 19,20a, 17,20b, 18 – so that the twofold reference to the cup is avoided, and only the holy communion cup is mentioned.^{XXVIII}

So much for the textual facts of the matter: they demand an explanation of their origin, and now, it becomes clear yet again, how essentially different our question is from the formulated problem of the theologists (and that of the critics-of-relative as well). The question of the theologists aims at the "original" version in Luke – on the as natural rated assumption that *one* of the two texts would have to be genuine. *W Bauer* writes: "*The question is of course still unanswered, whether in Luke's holy communion pericope, verses 19b and 20 with S, B, A and C are to be considered original, or with D and a number of Itala codices, are to be thrown out. Both opinions have been supported by famous names. So far however, there is no conceivable motivation, how 19b and 20, had they been original, could have been erased, or, in the other case, how this subsequent growth is to be explained.*"⁶⁰

They do not yet admit to it, but it proves to be sufficiently clear that a *natural* explanation for the variant mystery is nowhere to be found. Willy-nilly, the critics-of-relative content

XXVIII I don't understand this re-arrangement thing, dear reader; it seems to make no sense when I look at my KJ wording. Maybe I'm doing it wrong?

themselves with a draw, because the question on which ultimately everything depends, is alien to their thought process and research. Here as well, the crucial question is this: natural or artificial? And since every naturally practical explanation fails, the answer can only be: the bundle of variants of Luke's holy communion report is an artificial product grown from dogmatic-theological tensions, fabricated by the learned fathers of the medieval falsification action.

We have already hinted at it: the stone of contention is the sacred holy communion cup. And then, we remember the tumultuous cup controversy within the church of the closing Middle Ages. Now, the omission of verse 20 in Luke's report supposedly suggests that the during the consumption of the supper (of the laymen) handed bread (as Christ's body) is fully sufficient; so, the for the lay-Christian uncomfortable cup withdrawal is to be motivated by the mutilated Luke. From this situation, the silence of the fourth evangelist on the precarious holy communion affair, including the fact that the alienating gap in this gospel has never been filled, is explained as well. Under no circumstances could John have been permitted to take sides towards either party by his own description of the events, which latter would have become all too weighty in its statements. Only at a time when the cup question was factual and acute – in the late Middle Ages – the variants in the handwritings D, in the early Latiners and Syrians, which all deliberately place the Lord's supper in a dogmatic-historical twilight, could have been installed, i.e these codices could not possibly stem from the 4th/5th century. And the other "age-old" parchment volumes such as S, B, A, C etc.? Despite all "attributes of authenticity", these handwritings could not have come into being in the 4th/5th century, either. Proof (on this level) is delivered by the talkative silence of John's gospel: *in each of those codices*, a report of the fourth evangelist on the institution of the Lord's supper is missing. This lack however, finds a *natural motivation only in connection* with the origin of the variants in the handwritings D, Itala and early Syrians. That not all "old" parchment

codices originate from the same decade (of the Middle Ages), why, that some of the alleged Methuselahs have first seen the light of an office only in recent and most recent times, does not restrict the previous line of evidence, but merely modifies its basic stance. Always in the background however, stands as the last root cause of the variants' formation the fear of unique and clear statements in what is being reported.

XI. The uniform origin of the text families

As a result of the critique, we have, during the discussion of the three text examples in the previous chapter, gained the realisation that the in the standard codices met "deliberate" variants are set up following the contradiction pattern $x - y$, and $x - y - xy$, respectively. Such work of independent copyists according to a composition principle cannot be attributed to the workings of chance, but it assumes planful action, and thus, an agreement on the part of the involved scribes. For the copyists from the 4th and 5th century, such arrangement in this affair was impossible; the situation is different with the scribes who belonged to the acting personnel of the late medieval falsification action, with whom meetings about preferred tactics must have been the order of the day.

Are we now, on the basis of the listed variant examples, permitted to risk the final conclusion: thus, the existence of three main families of the new-testamentarian text tradition is not a natural phenomenon of a historical development, but is to be viewed as an artificially generated situation? Somebody who only knows the contents of the previous chapter will rightfully declare this conclusion premature, since it is not well enough founded. However, the reader of this work has already gained such comprehensive and solid foundation of

evidence, that they can judge from their own insight, whether even the few variant examples listed by us justify the conclusion of an artificial creation of the text groups. We want to do more than we are due however, and this time again, make *the entirety of the phenomenon of the text variants a problem* according to our method of critique. The fact of the main text families cannot be doubted; handwriting research has established their existence in thorough comparison work. What this is about is to find an explanation for the *formation* of these groups. We have already racked our brains enough as to which natural causes may have perhaps been in effect in order to enable the remarkable split in the wording of the biblical scripts in the "old" church. Let us yet have a closer look at these attempts of a "natural" explanation.

Yet again, we calmly assume that the tradition of the NT is genuine at its root, and that it has experienced a natural development later on. Now, all considerations revolving around the problem of the biblical variant muddle must necessarily choose their starting point with the findings of the text the way it is presented in the standard codices. Starting from this basis, if we examine the further development of the text forwards through the centuries, then we gain a surprising and highly important realisation. It turns out that *all momentous ("deliberate") contradictions* in the wording are *already fixed in the 4th century* (the alleged time of creation of the "oldest" parchment handwritings). If we also consider the newly discovered papyri, then the point in time of the origin of the main variants is even moved back into the 2nd century. Thus, we stand before the "fact" that almost immediately after the writing-down of the biblical originals, a carefree and unrestrained "editing" of their genuine wording "sets in". The conspicuousness of this phenomenon is further highlighted by the equally conspicuous "fact" that *after* the 4th century, substantial variants no longer occur.

If the theological researchers are asked for their opinion, how it could happen that during the earliest times of Christianity, such unheard-of text confusion was created, they answer: "*The text of the NT has not been irrevocably fixed in the first two centuries.*"⁶¹

This information explains nothing however, it merely describes the situation with a new twist. We therefore ask further: then why should the wording (of for example the gospels and the Acts) not have been fixed initially? Why, has it not been present in the allegedly only quite recently created original scripts? After all, this *is about the copies of these autographs!* The theologians have much pondered over this basic mystery of the new-testamentarian tradition; but they feel a little uneasy in this, because they have to admit: the affair is hard to explain. Eventually, a few "natural" explanations were yet found for the outbreak of the [biblical] flood of variants in the first few centuries. According to those, the tottering text could "basically" be considered quite natural. Our curiosity aroused, we carefully listen to such explanation attempts.

E Nestle claims to have discovered the root cause for the text confusion in the stupidity of the copyists [here we go again...]: "*The scribes were often ignorant people who copied their originals with great faith [!; K.], but with equally big simplicity [!; K.]. Thus, the countless amount of mistakes in writing.*"⁶²

E Fascher has a different opinion: to the contrary, he traces the chaos to the cleverness of the copyists. "*These handwritings stem from people who did not mechanically copy an original, but who on the basis of their own contemplation, improved the text, made it clearer or more easily understandable, as they reckoned. By proceeding in that manner, they became translators and interpreters of a text to be copied, which latter their ordering customers never got to see, that means as a result: the interpreting copyist positions himself*

between text and copy, thus forcing his interpretation on the later reader, since the latter has no knowledge of an authoritative text."⁶³ [ugh... these guys are killing me.]

Nestle and *Fascher* are presenting arguments that behave like minus and plus, and ultimately, cancel each other out. We have to now project things, or much rather, project the just described persons (scribes), to the (alleged) reality of the 1st/2nd century, in order to enable us to judge how their existence and behaviour fits into the primevally christian environment. According to *Nestle*, the copyists were simple people; their many errors and slips of the pen stem from their ignorance. But what was then asked in christian circles of the early period with regards to the qualities of a copyist? These people did not really have to be learned mathematicians or philosophers by trade. For their profession, they were sufficiently educated when they had firstly learned writing, secondly understood Greek, and thirdly were familiar with the main doctrines (terms) of their religion. Indubitably, the copyists "back then" would have met those requirements, else they could hardly expect to find employment as copyists of Greek bible codices. And then, during all times, a good copyist had to meet one basic condition: they had to carry out the work with which they had been entrusted "with great truthfulness"; and that, according the *Nestle*, was the case with the "early christian" copyists, thank God. What follows from that? That such simple, but conscientiously working people could offer the very best guarantee for good, almost faultless copies in the 1st/2nd century as well. Since he who copies truthfully does not proceed flightily, but instead, is forced to proceed under constant strain of their attention. Also, such conscientious person, if they could perhaps not decipher a word of their original, would ask a colleague for advice; short and sweet: especially the *Nestleian* scribe would have been an ideal copyist, who would have delivered a very clean script with *only few* writing mistakes

Not so the copyist whom *Fascher* has painted himself; they reveal themselves to be textbook examples of scribes *as they should not be*. Let us examine how this type fits into a christian primeval community, i.e. into real life. Sure, they are teeming with education, but they do not rate truthfulness when copying. They know so many things, not to say everything, much better than their original, i.e. as the author, the evangelist. It is beneath their dignity to copy mechanically; they do not merely copy, but they "create", by high-handedly subjecting the handed down text to their "interpretation". They know nothing of an authoritative standing of the works they are meant to copy, although those works are clerical writings standing in high esteem, and whose originals had been authored only a few years prior. The *Fascherian* copyist saw his main task in "improving" and "clarifying" as much as possible. Thus, they forcefully imprint the brand of their spirit on each biblical template, and behold: the customers – a Presbyterian or a bishop – like this procedure; delighted, they receive the "modified" copies, and happily use them in sermon and teaching – without any member of the community taking issue with this; that holy books are now being used, which latter contradict each other in the wording in so many places!

Fascher and other theologists will say: admittedly, such liberty in the treatment of the text on the part of the primevally christian scribes may seem incredible to us; but we have to bow before the facts, because the old codices witness in handwriting just how little respect was credited to the wording. And that is why the theological researchers, time and again, are looking for an explanation for the (paper!) fact. The attempt as well, which *Fascher* is undertaking however, teaches us that a *natural* explanation cannot be found. We need not lose another word on this, because the *Fascherian* "interpreter", as a psychological *mass phenomenon* – the way as has supposedly been the case – is an impossibility in the environment of primeval Christianity.

Kenyon and others have the following explanation at hand: they do not want to deny that the evangelists were pursuing a practical purpose when composing their narrations of the life of Jesus and the work of his apostles, namely *"to spread the knowledge of their fiefs and teachings in the christian community"*. However – and now Kenyon presents *his* explanation – *"nobody thought of the future of these scripts, because considering Jesus' resurrection, this future would have only been of a short duration anyhow; so, why then should one be so much intent on truthfully dealing with the wording?"*⁶⁴ Kenyon finds this argument immediately evident, because he reassures: *"In the face of such circumstances, one need of course (!) not wonder over the rise of a multitude of variants."* We rate his explanation by no means natural, because it assumes again, on the side of the copyists, a mass appearance of know-it-alls. Also, imagine, if you will, the mental state of a devout Christian from the "earliest" time; they expect the imminent ending of this world, or the imminent return of the Lord, respectively! So, they want to be, and they must be, prepared for that day. How can they adequately prepare? By doing and believing that which is right (wanted by God)! To them, what is right is written in the gospels which contain Jesus' deeds and teachings as an example and as an admonition. And the devout finds the "spirit" of the teachings dressed in certain words – now, in this situation of the expectance of the Lord's imminent return, how could a Christian, as a copyist, have seriously considered interpreting and bettering the word of the saviour (the wording of Jesus' teachings fixed in writing)! How could not only one – no – how could *many* writers in such tense situation have been prepared to change the "holy" text quite carefreely and after their own fancy! The customers and the entire community would have complimented such know-it-all (or even a sloppily working copyist) out of the office. When copying the gospels "back then", they were of course not thinking "of the future" of these scripts, but all the more of the necessary present of these books, their immediate existence. And more than anything, every devout Christian would have insisted on getting

their hands on a copy with the "correct" wording. So, in "reality", all copyists would have been restrained to copying the text of the original as correctly as even possible, i.e. the outbreak of a [biblical] flood of variants within only one century could never have taken place.

Even the most learned theologian will not find a *natural* explanation for the variant muddle prevailing in the handwritings (from the "early time"), for the simple reason that it has been proven that there is an artificially generated problem lurking here. How often have we dug up such artificial problems now; the handwritten tradition of the NT – and not only the biblical one, either! – is lousy with them. We will momentarily meet a new cluster of problems, when we next position ourselves on the bridge of the text tradition from the 2nd to the 4th century.

Still boldly assuming that the biblical tradition possesses historical factuality, we then can establish, that in the ample realm of variants from the 2nd to the 4th century, a great many things must have happened. Regarding these ongoing, certainly, the "compatriots", else very talkative, cloak themselves in silence as if they were afraid of giving away secrets. As is well-known, the 4th century is considered the birth age of our famous biblical parchment Methuselahs, and we already know that with the appearance of the standard codices, *the three text families* also appear, and start multiplying. The phenomenon of the split of the text into three main groups must now be assessed once again, that is, this time, it is about *the question of the formation* of the three-fold layering. Graphically speaking: in the 1st/2nd century, an ocean of variants is surging before us, in the 4th century, we see this water flow along in three river-beds. How have those channels formed however? Who has dug them, and directed the water of variants into them? This important matter must have yet

been planned and carried out by human beings (Christians) "back then"; but by what entities? Deep silence in the wide circle of the "contemporaries".

The theologists of today patronise us to the effect that sometime and somewhere in this period – before the 4th century – revisions of the text had been carried out, to somehow effect order in the muddle of the variants. That is, according to the testimony of the standard handwritings, *three big text revisions* must have taken place. Let us ask *Kenyon* for the situation in more detail. He shrugs his shoulders, and admits: "*At what time, and by whom the revisions, to which our nowadays text families trace back, have been carried out, we do not know... all we can say is that around the 4th century, the main differences in the individual traditions had been fully developed.*" (It shall be remarked that some researchers claim to have discovered two of the text revisionists in the Presbyterian Lucian and an otherwise unknown Hesychius, both allegedly living around 300.) *Kenyon* has contemplated just how to imagine the (discreet) ongoing, and arrives at the following view: "*Revisions were locally and temporally limited, they were founded on the initiative of individual bishops or scholars, and their influence mostly reached no further than the immediate neighbourhood. Also, occasionally, handwritings may have ended up getting from one part of the Empire to another, perhaps from Rome to Antiochia or Alexandria, or vice versa, and the here available specimen have been corrected according to those, so that a mixture of the varying local texts was formed.*"^{XXIX} According to this description, revisions were random and independent actions within the vast realm of the church; the church as an overall entity did not concern itself with the troublesome variant nuisance. This (paper!) fact must surprise us to the highest degree; because at the same time on a different matter, the church supposedly thought united and acted united in all of their communities: when it was about determining as to which christian writings (gospels, letters etc.) should be incorporated in the "canon", and

XXIX The more *Kenyon* says, the worse it gets. What goes on in a head like his?

together, should be sanctioned as the "federal book" of the overall church. How suddenly this unity in thinking and acting was achieved "back then", over this as well, the big silence of the "contemporaries" is hovering, but we cannot concern ourselves in more depth on *this* highly important event at this point; we want to merely take note that the church, when the occasion arose, was quite capable of being united in "such early times".

What? Then, with the formal canonisation of certain writings, everything would have been completed and in order "back then"? Would not the very most important task have still stood before the church demanding: the creation of a fixed, uniform wording of the canonised writings? Yet again assuming that it could have even gotten to this hopeless text confusion so soon – which would have been impossible in the real life of the first Christians – then they would have had to say to themselves, and not only in this or that community: this cannot go on any longer, order must be achieved as soon as possible; by all means, *all of Christianity* had to place the utmost value on cleansing the text-gone-wild, and at the same time, on arranging it *uniformly*. Those contemporaries would certainly not have been so dumb or indifferent that they could have overlooked not only the advantage, but also the necessity of a fixed, uniformly worded text. And how quickly and easily could such action have been carried out in those early times. All that they would have had to do was fetch the *autographs* of the letters and gospels, and the whole variant spook would have disappeared over night. After all, this is a deep secret again: why were the original scripts not consulted? "Back then", why did – barely a hundred years after they had been written – all the christian world pretend as if no autographs had ever existed?

The new-testamentarian autographs have of course existed, the theologists reply: unfortunately however, the primeval scripts have been *lost back then already!* "*In the first centuries already, we can find no trace that they (the primeval scripts) had still been extant*

*and well-known. Else, church teachers such as Tertullian, Origenes a.o. would certainly... have consulted the autographs... in arguments with the Heretics over the text."*⁶⁵ Thus, the primeval scripts must have disappeared again incredibly quickly, that is, *all* primeval scripts of the canonical books! There are explainers who reckon that such swift disappearance makes no wonder by any means, because during the times of persecution, the originals had been snatched from the Christians, and destroyed. Certainly, many christian writings must have been dug up and destroyed, but equally as certainly would the Christians, during difficult times, have made timely arrangements for precautionary measures, primarily in order to hide and rescue the autographs. It is impossible that *all* originals could have been destroyed in such short period of time. As is well-known, in that early epoch – when there has already not been one sheet left of the primeval scripts – the persecution of the church has supposedly been still bearable, and has only occurred in smaller, locally restricted actions. Additionally, "back then", the immediate copies of the originals possessing almost rank and value of the autographs would still have existed.

But alright then: let us entrust ourselves for a little longer to the (falsified) tradition, and let us have ourselves convinced that as early as in the 2nd century, nothing was known anymore of originals (and primeval scripts) in the church communities. So, in those times, it was here and there attempted to put a stop to the further degeneration of the text. How should this commendable resolution be carried out however? Why, it has been entirely arbitrary, how a primeval Christian, who fancied doing so, would have gone about tackling the affair. We now leave the talking to *Kenyon* again, who will show to us that the revisers "indeed" quite individually solved their task.

1. *text a, also byzantine text.* (Here, codex A is one of the main witnesses regarding the gospels. Else, *a* is represented by the majority of majuscules and almost all minuscules.)

Some revisers *"essentially saw their task in rendering the text as clear and understandable as possible... The result was a readily legible text which had of course lost much of its original character from which... it deviated considerably... in the details. A text such as the a text has formed in this manner."* This text (which then has resulted in the most disseminated text, the "Textus Receptus") has been changed by revision *"to a growing extent"*. *"That does not mean that this revision was a planful undertaking at a particular time... It much rather represents the result of forces and intentions which had an effect over a long time. In part, those were not conscious intentions..."* Unfortunately, nobody will be able to make quite that much sense out of the "not planfully", and in part even under "not conscious intentions" proceeding birth of this so-called Byzantine text family. Why, it is yet quite difficult (better: impossible) wanting to solve an artificially generated problem by natural means, after all.

2. *Text b, also neutral or Alexandrian text.* (Main witnesses are the codices B and S.)

According to *Kenyon*, the primeval church owes this text to a *"trained scholar whose first rule was exactitude, not edification."* *"He exerts himself consulting the oldest handwritings available to him, and to compare their reading in the light of critical science... and since the b text seems to be based upon these principles, most scholars today reckon that overall, it offers to us the purest text."*⁶⁶ What a pity that this "primevally christian" scholar could not access a single primeval script around 100-150! Else, how easy and reliable would the result of his publishing work have been.

3. *Text d, also Western text.* (Leading representatives: codex D and early Latiners.)

The originator of this most peculiar of all the text groups was supposedly a publisher, *"who felt more independent in his work"*. He *"treated the text more freely, he changed expressions after his own taste... rather inserted something than omitting something... This is roughly*

how to imagine the formation of the d text." [Oh, please!] This by *Kenyon* sketched revisionist must have obviously been a great oracle reader and self-glorifying know-it-all, a scholar who, during his operations, has certainly *not* missed the "lost" autographs. He would also have been the foreseeing man who as early as in the 2nd/3rd century, had the idea that one day in later times, the holy communion cup would kindle fights, which is why he felt duty-bound to timely take precautionary textual measures.

Kenyon still distinguishes a text *y* and a text *e*. It is of course possible to separate such sub groups from the main families on the basis of certain shared peculiarities, but this procedure does not suspend the principal significance attributed to the three textual Upper-Classes.

No different, and no better than is the case with the above ideas regarding the formation of the text groups, do the explanation attempts of other bible scientists come out. This makes no wonder; because we know that this here as well, is again one of the many by the globe turners artificially generated situations of the tradition that cannot be rendered conceivable by sensible argumentation. Only two clues are required to make the fantasy character of the allegedly christian ongoing regarding the text composition clearly stand out.

Let us remember – from chapter VII – that the main witnesses of text *b*, codices B and S, have supposedly been written in *Egypt*. "Back then", the "Alexandrian" text type upon which these handwritings are based should have been common, i.e. in use in the christian communities of the land by the Nile. That was indubitably the case, too, say the bible scientists only to add with some embarrassment: but the Alexandrian text has not been the autocratically prevailing one in the 2nd/3rd century; in Egypt, other text forms were in use simultaneously, probably because the new revision was not able to assert itself right away. We could accept this reasoning. If we then hear however, that with the Egyptian communities

of those early days - as especially suggested by the recent [~ly discovered] papyri – representatives of *all* text families (except the Byzantine one) peacefully coexisted in clerical practice, then our critical suspicion becomes wide awake. In theory and fiction of course, no difficulties and arguments arise from the proclaimed fact of the coexistence (mess!) of the most varied text forms; but if these things are placed into the tough practice of the primevally christian-Egyptian environment, then they take on a different behaviour, they then become active and begin to slam into each other where they are.

Who still tends to reckon that such text salad could at least have been possible to be the faith dish in teaching and sermon by the Nile, is invited to join us in throwing a glance at the text of the codices B and S, *both* of which represent *one family*, the Alexandrian one. We recall to memory that B and S, as is concluded by certain graphical peculiarities, have even supposedly sprung to life in the same (Egyptian) office. (We ignore here that their birthplaces are in truth found elsewhere altogether and in much later centuries.) Members of a family will look similar, especially when they are twins (such as B and S) - one would think. In this regard now, we meet a surprise with B and S. Well, many shared family attributes are found in the text, but very often we get startled, and stand before parts in which the two brothers show no unity and drift apart. Only a few significant examples from the Luke gospel shall be listed. In the framework of the story of suffering, Luke 22,43-44 deals with Jesus' death struggle and his strengthening by an angel appearing from heaven. Codex S brings this scene, in codex B, it is omitted. By the way, the death struggle report is also missing in A, while D contains it, i.e. S goes along with D, while B joins A. In Luke 23,34, Jesus speaks on the cross: father, forgive them... which is found in B as well: B omits this request again.^{xxx} And in this case, S does not go along with D as before, but with A, while B also changes the partner, and regarding the omitted request, conforms with D. A further example of the

xxx This of course makes no sense. Presumably, one of the two 'B's was originally an 'S'.

contradiction between S and B is given by Luke 24,51 with the announcement of Jesus' ascension in Bethany; this time, it is B containing this detail, while S (together with D) remain silent on this!

What does all of this mean? What does it mean, that stark contradictions exist even between twin codices of the same revision? For a critic who does not neglect imagining the described situation in the reality and practice of the relevant environment, the answer is soon certain. The verdict is this: from certain signs of the earliest text history, we have to conclude that the same humans (the same circle of Christians allegedly from the 2nd/3rd century) who have deemed necessary, and have also carried out, a text revision of their (canonical) church writings, have used this cleansing action to *immediately incorporate new variants* of the drastic kind *into the cleansed text*! This alleged fact can only be invented, because else, it would assume a mental disposition of the harshest contradictiveness which, as a mass phenomenon in the real life of devout Christians of those days, would have been impossible.

The (paper) phenomenon of an unrestrained text "improvement" together with monstrous text mixing, the way it confronts us as "fact" during the first centuries in Egypt, *cannot* be viewed as having formed *by chance*. This text mixing whose main characteristic is the contradiction, *must be intentional*! With this result, the critique steers towards the line of evidence of the previous chapter, because the result of the artificiality of all "primevally christian" text variants gained there, is being supplemented and fully confirmed by the former. Let us particularly remember the result that the variants - the "certain" ones are referred to here – are *adjusted to each other* in the standard codices. Every step along the way, it is palpable that the contradictions (and with them, the text mixing) are *intended*, and that the so-called revisions in truth serve to planfully shape and split the overall text, in order

to fix and immortalise the contradictions of the salvation history. The church has never dared *decide which text (of the three) is meant to be the revealed one.*

All these observations of the "primevally christian" text sensibly allow only for the conclusion: the in the "old" parchment codices embodied text families must have a uniform (artificial, theoretical) origin, and owe their joint formation to an action that temporally falls in a much later century.

XII. The text mixture of the newly discovered papyri

All recent and most recent discoveries of new-testamentarian papyri so joyfully welcomed by the bible scientists are (modern) forgeries. Since the on a dozen individual proofs based general result of our previous investigations states that the primeval parchment ancestors A, B, C, D and S... cannot possibly be script witnesses from the 4th/5th century, it is thus ruled out that the in Egypt and Syria newly discovered papyri represent authentic specimen from the first centuries. This conclusion is reached off-hand by the tight textual relations of these papyri with the standard codices. On the peculiarity and significance of these textual connections, something telling will still have to be said; next however, we hear a report on an interesting observation that is connected to the history of the new papyrus discoveries. This observation reveals to us that the *succession of the discoveries* has been secretly *controlled*.

We focus our attention on those papyrus fragments which contain sentences from chapters *of John's gospel*. Immediately striking is the relatively high number of papyri with text bits from that gospel. If we include P 66 (papyrus Bodmer II), then there are 18 with the

text of the fourth gospel found among the 68 previously known papyri overall. On this, *K Aland* presents the following overview:

P 2	5th/6th century	chapter 12
P 5	3rd/4th century	chapters 1, 16, 20
P 6	5th/6th century	chapters 10, 11
P 22	3rd or 4th century	chapters 15, 16
P 28	4th century	chapter 6
P 36	6th century	chapter 3
P 39	4th century	chapter 8
P 44	6th/7th century	chapters 9, 10, 12
P 45	3rd century	chapter 10
P 52	2nd century	chapter 18
P 55	6th century	chapter 1
P 59	7th/8th century	chapters 1, 2, 11, 12, 17, 18, 21
P 60	7th/8th century	chapters 16, 17, 18, 19
P 63	5th/6th century	chapters 3, 4
P 66	2nd/3rd	chapters 1-14!

John's gospel consists of 21 chapters. Overlooking the table, we can establish that with the found papyri today, all 21 chapters are represented. We need not care now for the fact that most fragments contain only a few verses from the relevant chapters; crucial are only the chapter numbers here, more accurately: the *succession* of the chapters.

In the table, we find the papyri listed top-to-bottom according to their consecutive succession of their discoveries, or their publication, respectively. So, with P 2 at first, chapter 12 (fragments) have been brought to light; with P 5, chapters 1, 16 and 20 surfaced. If we view these first chapter finds, we find nothing objectionable here; chance seems to have worked quite naturally. P 6 has then gifted chapters 10 and 11 to the bible scientists. Very nice of chance to not repeat itself in the chapter finds, but instead, to always come up with new chapters! By that time, collectors of papyri of John were already curious whether perhaps next time as well, something-not-yet-existing would appear on the discovery market. Right: with P 22, chapters 15 and 16 were registering. Bravo, Mr Chance, carry on like that!

With P 28 indeed now, chapter 6 stepped out from the Egyptian soil. Chance had gotten the idea by now: P 36 brought another novelty with chapter 3, equally P 39 with chapter 8, and once again P 44 with chapter 9! Tagging along with chapter 9, there was a repetition of 10 and 12 this time. This is however – and this is what is crucial – no repetition by content, because the chapters 10 and 12 of P 44 *present different verses* to those of the relevant chapters of P 2 and P 6, and thus, something new yet. In the succession of the discoveries, with P 45, yet another repetition of chapter 10 follows; but this time again, the verses are only partially the same by content, because while P 6 and P 44 only reach up to verse 14, P 45, for the first time, contains sentences reaching beyond verse 15. Following this, chance delivered again something entirely new with P 52, namely chapter 18. Next was P 55, again with chapter 1; this time, it results in a duplicate of P 5 by content. P 59 may have presented repetitions as well with the chapters 1, 11, 12 and 18, but it has also given away something-not-yet-existing, namely the chapters 2, 17 and 21. With regards to the chapter repetitions however, the John's-papyri collector experienced the joy that this time, chapters 11, 12 and 18 came up *with entirely new verses by content!* The very best of thanks to you, dear Mr Chance! Next then, P 60 appeared on the scene with the chapters 16, 17, 18 and 19. Chapter 19 is the novelty here. It is also novel that for the first time, a bigger portion of John's gospel ascended from the Egyptian soil in uninterrupted succession (from chapter 16, verse 29 through to chapter 19, verse 26, with smaller gaps). New was chapter 4 with the next find, P 63; as a repetition, chapter 3 appears again, representing a duplicate of P 36 regarding the content as well. Making the final in the series of discoveries – as it should be – the shining and high point P 66 (papyrus Bodmer II), recovering in one blow what chapters, up to this point, had been missing of the fourth gospel, namely the chapters 5, 7, 13 and 14! This famous papyrus forcefully broke with the overcome custom of merely offering measly fragments and rags; in "downright fabulous" preservation, P 66 steps before the theological

co-world with 108 pages. On these pages, John's gospel is contained as an uninterrupted unit from the first verse up to chapter 14 ,26, only the pages 35-38 are missing.

Amazing, what chance has managed again here! After all, it has managed to influence and control the discovery history of the John papyri in such a way, that every new find has brought to light new portions of the gospel's content. Two exceptions with small duplicates of some verses merely confirm the rule. Here, we can notice the phenomenon of a planful succession of ever different parts of the gospel with the aim of gradually securing the entire content without unnecessary reprisals. The systematic nature of this discovery mode becomes really clear, when we consider that the individual finds allegedly stem from the most varying centuries and the most varying finding places. *Genuine* chance is not known for such insightful behaviour!

The Egyptian Koms and ruins also betray pedagogic talent, in a manner of speaking; they make sure that the discoveries follow the rule: from the small to the big, from little to much. Thus, there were of course mostly rags and individual sheets of John's gospel found in the beginning; today, we are as far as a fat lump of 100 and more pages ascending from the Earth. This is connected with the circumstance that nowadays, papyri do not ascend naked and merely from the rubble, but they are unearthed well-stored in vessels, preferably pitchers. The history of archaeological discoveries has its peculiarities, too; currently, pitcher finds are all the rage in the realm of the *written* tradition. Pitcher finds are more advantageous as well: they offer the option of collective discoveries, and they guarantee a flawless preservation of "age-old" tradition specimen!

What is still left now is to carry out the at the beginning of the chapter announced investigation of the problem of the textual relations – more accurately: *the variant relations* – between the newly discovered biblical papyri and the standard codices (A, B, C, D, S).

For a starting point to the investigation serves us the by the papyrologists established "fact"-of-relative, that the new papyri, beginning with the Chester Beatty specimen reaching to P 66 (Bodmer II), have been created one to two centuries earlier than the five big parchment codices. As is well-known, the origin of the oldest handwritings is placed in the 4th century, while the papyri are dated back to the 3rd, even the 2nd century. Assuming this were the case in reality indeed, then everybody would agree with the conclusion, that the writers of the "earlier" papyri could not yet know of the "later" codices of the 4th and 5th century. For example: in real life, the writer of P 66 could not possibly foresee the later existence of parchment handwriting D, or even have had foreknowledge of their peculiar variant work.

For the further detailing of the textual relations problem, it is still required to imagine once more the (alleged) offices of the church communities of the 2nd/3rd century, and to recall to memory the circumstances which were supposedly possible regarding the textual quality within Christianity "back then". After all, as the bible scientists reassure us, there was open season on the wording of the clerical writings in the first centuries! This was by no means about the unavoidable mistakes from flightiness during copying – those had of course promptly been corrected as well; no, this was about the meaning of the words and sentences, and on this point, according to the theologians, we must swallow the "fact", that every copyist could, and was permitted to, try themselves as interpreters and quibblers, in short: as improvers, depending on their insight and fancy. So, the problem of relations subjected to examination entails those *certain* variants, and as we know, there is truly no shortage of that sort in the new-testamentarian tradition of the early times. According to the papyri, a completely degenerated wording of the gospels has to be established for as early as the 2nd century, so that in the 4th century, it was the highest time to cleanse the text-turned-weed as well as possible, and to introduce revisions to that end. At this point in time however, we are

less interested in the (alleged) revisions, but much rather in the preceding situation, i.e. the variant muddle the way it presents itself to us in the papyri.

If we now, for tactical considerations, pretend for a moment that the since 1930 discovered papyri are genuine, we pick out two examples in order to demonstrate the text situation from the early times by concrete details. For example material, we choose two papyri excelling by their larger volume, namely the Chester Beatty fragment (P 45) and the Bodmer II codex (P 66).

What does the by the bible scientists established text diagnosis teach us regarding P 45? What comes out if we compare the wording of this Chester Beatty specimen with the text forms of the main families appearing in the handwritings A, B, C, D and S? The overall result of the comparisons is this: textually, P 45 can be attributed to none of the main groups; much rather, the text shows *kinsmanship relations to all families!*

The following table demonstrates by numbers the cases in which P 45 partially conforms with the parchment main witnesses of the families, and partially deviates from them.⁶⁷

Table of conformity and deviations for the gospel of Mark:

P 45	<i>with</i>	codex S:	42 times	<i>against</i>	S:	108 times
P 45	<i>with</i>	codex A:	54 times	<i>against</i>	A:	94 times
P 45	<i>with</i>	codex B:	44 times	<i>against</i>	B:	106 times
P 45	<i>with</i>	codex C:	31 times	<i>against</i>	C:	67 times
P 45	<i>with</i>	codex D:	49 times	<i>against</i>	D:	100 times

Let us stay with the numbers for now, they are something else. In the concept of P 45, its (allegedly primevally christian) author proceeded plenty oddly. After procuring handwritings of all text families, they said: now I compile a wonderful *text mixture* for my community, by

picking out the best from the originals! However, the likes of us must be impartial, so I will not prefer any family in a striking manner, but I will share my preference almost equally, and thus, I shall proceed like so: ... The secret of his procedure is given away to us by the above listed numbers, which are conspicuously frequently divisible by 6 (partially with a small remainder)! (Let us only take the first column of numbers for a sample: $42:6=7$; $54:6=9$; $44:6=7$ (remainder: 2); $31:6=5$ (remainder: 1); $49:6=8$ (remainder: 1)) The situation should be fully clear here: during the fabrication of his lumped together text muddle, the good man has proceeded by a mechanical pattern. Naturally, he did not use this template only. Thus, he had the text of his P 45 within Luke's gospel conform with codex D 136 times, and deviate from it 137 times. In John's gospel, he balanced conformity and deviation quite accurately with regards to D: 40 times for, and 40 times against that handwriting!

The so created text muddle was a matter of indifference to this allegedly devout early Christian in terms of the nature and the meaning of the content. Question: to whom can the here revealed work modus sooner be attributed, a christian community member allegedly from the beginning of the 3rd century, or a modern forger (syndicate of forgers) who had been given the task of compiling a papyrus text based upon the standard codices, a text that would truly universally do justice to the by situation varying requirements of those early times? The answer cannot prove difficult. The described behaviour is only possible with a modern forger, but to them, it is also necessary, since they have to proceed delicately in the face of the great theological-dogmatic significance of the "early text", and they must not permit themselves any bold newly creations of variants in this area. If they are clever in such precarious cases, they cling to what is already known and acknowledged, i.e. they take in turns whatever is required for the textual decoration of their "age-old" papyri, from the standard codices.

We now turn to the second example, codex Bodmer II (P 66), which is allegedly 100 years older still, since it has supposedly been written around the year 200. This voluminous papyrus with the first 14 chapters of John's gospel may not have been examined quite as thoroughly as the Chester Beatty fragments, but the investigations of the publisher have already secured one overall result that we have fully expected: going by the habit of its wording, P 66 also presents the iridescent text mix from the "early times"! This papyrus, too, surprises us with characteristic interpretations from all standard handwritings. We reference *Aland* again: *"The text of P 66 presents to us... the same picture as the Chester Beatty papyri. The separation into "text groups" or "text families" has not yet existed during those early times, they are a result of the 4th century. In the 3rd century, when the big "revisions" had not been carried out yet, we find in one handwriting versions in intimate togetherness which – viewed from later on – do not seem to belong together at all. The "text mixture" characterises the early times."*

The text mixture characterises the early times. With this flat statement, *Aland* dispatches the most difficult problem in which we have been intensely interested for a little while. But *Aland* and all other bible scientists have only viewed the surface of the problem, they have noticed nothing of the cliffs in the depth of the problem. The Chester Beatty fragments and the papyrus Bodmer II have supposedly been written by early christian copyists – very well, but then, we would like to be told the solution to the psychological mystery, how people living allegedly around 300, why, even 200, could already have had knowledge of text variants which would turn up only in handwritings of the around 400 occurring revisions? After all, according to the text researchers' opinion, certain, quite characteristic readings as well as omissions or additions represent *active*, i.e. *individual* compositions of the wording *by the instigators of the revisions*. Thus, the revisers were pro-actively creative, i.e. they did not simply filter out ready-made readings from an existing

variant medley appealing to them, but they allegedly sought to *edit* (to improve!) what they found according to their insight. If thus, the characteristic variants are the result of the revisions, then *before* and *outside* of the hypothetical cleansing action, they did *not* exist as such! It therefore remains a mystery, from where specific revision-variants could penetrate the back-then text mixture around 300, and even 200. Should we assume that the actions for the cleansing of the degenerated text have occurred as early as around 200 or earlier? In that case, the authors of P 45 and P 66 must have enjoyed to equally catch with a convergent lens the special readings of the revisions – which were handed down separately and still unmixed by the relevant group codices – and to unite them to variant bundles. After all, the text researchers explicitly assure that the scribes of P 45 and P 66 had not developed any pro-actively creative energy; what is contained in their documents in terms of important readings, has long been known from the later parchment handwritings, and their own, previously unknown variants are of no essential significance.

Let us assume against better knowledge that with the "primeval Christians", it has been possible and customary to unrestrainedly "improve" the original wording during copying of their holy books; then it could not stand out, but it would go without saying, if P 45 and P 66 were indeed presenting an anthology of (any random!) variants, in a selection just the way it had randomly occurred to the copyists. Not the bare fact of a variant medley would be wondrous; but since over time, the chaos had to become ever greater, and ever new readings were surfacing, P 66 should have shown a differently constructed mix to that of P 45, because it [P 66] stood at a later stage of the development. Now, this is not the case. There is nothing to be perceived in terms of development with regards to the basic stock of important variants. Although the points in time of origin of the two papyri supposedly lay apart a hundred years, they present the same core of variants; they basically show the same text mixture whose constituents consist of the characteristic revision readings. The revision

variants however, stick to the main codices, or their originals, respectively. *Kenyon* thus reckons of course that the readings of P 45 "*either stemmed from the big families, or they have gotten into them later*". [*rolleyes*] It is a pity that even with the best of will, it simply cannot be established, just exactly when the big text families have formed "in reality". *Aland* puts this action into the 4th century; *Kenyon* holds back, and admits with resignation, that the 'when' and 'how' of these hypothetical events are covered in deep darkness, unfortunately.

We are coming to the end. The most important insight that archaeological document researchers can gain from the results of our investigations, is an admonition: show the utmost mistrust against all seeming authenticity attributes of the external kind! *All* external attributes of "Authenticity" of archaeological written testimony can be imitated, and *today, they are* skilfully *generated artificially*. The business of archaeological forgery has developed into a high art practised with scientific exactitude. For a long time, it has been a cinch to manufacture any desired document with regards to their external attributes in a manner allowing the product to splendidly pass all (*relative*) authenticity tests for their writing and material (papyrus, leather, parchment). This is true for the chemical as well as the physical technique of the forgeries. Let us not have ourselves baffled, when the allegedly high age of a discovery is "proven" in quite modern fashion by an examination for radioactive carbon-14! It would mean to underrate the intelligence of the forgers, if we assumed that the forgers would not have contemplated and, when needed, put into practice this welcome opportunity of exact age deception. The discoverer can take certain eggs out of any nest, on the premise that someone has previously placed those eggs there.

Predominantly, it is also necessary to be freed from the usual idea that archaeological forgeries are one-man-work. We must not always ask for the "one" forger of a find, but for the *forgery association* that had been at work. It is certain that occasionally, on a mostly

smaller scale, archaeological forgeries are being carried out by single individuals working on their own account. In probably all cases, a potential motif is the prospect of material gain, which is why such individual forgers ensure the swift "discovery" of their forgeries. Things are different, when *collective forces* decide upon as well as carry out a comprehensive action of archaeological document forgeries, especially when the enterprise is guided by "idealistic" motives, and is put into motion for a "good" cause. In such a case, there is no need to rush, this society consciously works for the longer, or even very long term. Depositing "old scripts" enjoys occurring during periods of war, when all the world is sufficiently pre-occupied by other worries rather than contemplating archaeological things. Then, a few years after the end of the war, the grandiose discoveries occur here and there in inhospitable areas, fashionably by the support of goats-gotten-lost as well.

Now, regarding particularly the "ideal" manufacture of the newly discovered biblical papyri, it has to be said: all seemingly ever so concrete *external* attributes speaking for their "authenticity" can do nothing against the power of conviction of the by us presented inner (psychological) proofs for the forgery of all of those pieces. The inner attributes have the last word. The surfaced new-testamentarian papyri are "ideal" association forgeries, and, as the inner (textual) diagnosis suggests, theologically-dogmatically trained forces must have been involved as initiators. This also follows from the good cause of such actions: *this is about the rescue of the historical Jesus*. The new discoveries are meant to deliver the archaeological proof, that the gospels have indeed been created during the first century, and that therefore, doubts over the formation of Christianity in those early times are "historically" no longer permitted. Other than their successful medieval predecessors however, the modern forgers have bad luck with their undertakings. They intended to lay a snare for the deniers of Jesus' historicity, and now, they are getting caught in the trap themselves. Because they have gone over the top; they permitted themselves more than can be dared under critical eyes. In the

holy urge to pre-date the new-testamentarian scripts as much as possible regarding their alleged time of origin, they have neglected all caution and overlooked the warning sign. For with every nudge back in time – as soon as the in the gospels reported things are examined as if they had occurred in the real life of "primeval Christians" – the improbability grows, that the gospel authors, with their obvious legends, would have found faith and tolerance amongst their hostile contemporaries. The reader may recall to memory what has previously been said in several places on the problem of the temporal placement of the formation of Christianity. Pre-dating the gospel formation to the first century, is for psychological reasons – especially for John's gospel – completely impossible.

However, the boldness of the forgery societies finds an explanation in the archaeological scientists' disposition of blind confidence in the "discoveries" of age-old papyri and parchments. The forgers gamble on the papyrologists' and parchmentologists' critical capitulation before the *objective external authenticity attributes* of the finds, and for the time being, they (the forgers) have unfortunately been proven right with their speculation. Will it carry on like this however? Will the scientists not soon notice, that in the garden of archaeology, there have been secret forces at work, and they still are at work, in order to set into rotation the globes of papyrology and the medieval parchmentology in certain directions?? Caution: artificial problems in the entire district of archaeology! Historical truth is suffering; when will someone set out to help it?

Book 2

The oral gospel

Introduction

Why is a thorough critical scrutinisation of certain portions of the new testament indispensable for each critic of Christianity's history? Because these scripts – they are the four gospels and the Acts – appear as the original and only proclaimers and witnesses for Jesus' life and the christian primeval history. Thus, everybody who has at heart the solution to the question of the historicity of the alleged founder of the christian religion, must patiently listen to and most thoroughly examine the statements of these literary crown witnesses, often explicitly emphasising the truth of their reports^{XXXI}.

Besides very few exceptions (David Fr. Strauss, Bruno Bauer, Arthur Drews), it was theologians – among those, liberal protestant church employees by the largest majority – who have been concerned with the problems of Jesus' life out of professional motivation. The results of their research are available to us in an over time enormously growing literature. He who now endeavours anew to set to work on the problem of the historicity of Jesus and the primeval apostles, would act unwisely and recklessly, if they were not to pay the due attention to the research of those men. We will therefore constantly reference this literature, in order to demonstrate by numerous examples, how things stand with the by the theologians employed examination method and the thus gained "critical" results. The confrontation will be kindled primarily in the part "The synoptical gospel". In all of this, we will remain conscious of our natural duty to never leave the ground of strict matter-of-factness.

The issues put to discussion in this and the following books do not only concern theologians; they [the issues] are about questions that move all thoughtful people who are also pursuing clarity and truth in the highest things.

The general questions raised by us are:

XXXI How to spot a liar: their report begins with an emphasis on its truthfulness.

Can the new-testamentarian books have been written by people (Christians) of the first century?

Has Christianity (the church) really formed during the first century?

I. Naive pseudo-proofs for the historicity of Jesus

As has been shown in the first book: at the end of the whole investigation process, all individual historical problems of the new testament necessarily group themselves to form the overall problem: Has Jesus really lived? Cautious, and thus not very faithful theologians usually evade this dangerous summation and crystallization of the individual problems into one central point, by declaring even the mere raising of the question for Jesus' historicity overly sceptical or grotesque. It has to be highlighted with praise however, that by no means all theologians think so cautiously and inconsistently. "*Considering the sources on Jesus available to us, the historian is permitted to, why, they perhaps must question everything with regards to him, even his existence as a person.*" Thus speaks F Kattenbusch.⁶⁸

Although the historical question of the historicity of the christian religion's alleged founder can only be solved effectively by historical-critical means, we meet, time and again, a supposedly "positive proof" which is praised as being so immediately evident, that potential negative-historical results would have to crumble upon its enormous "inner" power of conviction. From the side of theology, quite certain "proofs" are also uncommonly frequently introduced to the discussion, to allegedly strongly support authenticity and truthfulness of the primevally christian tradition. These are, in a manner of speaking, auxiliary proofs, trusty old theological support troops, often and with pleasure launched against the sceptical opponent.

1. "Inner experiences" as alleged proof for Jesus' historicity

It has to be acknowledged that generally, the "subjective proof" to be discussed now is not used by scientifically working theologians, but instead, is at home preferentially in the domain of systematic-practical theology and the lower apologetics. It was probably primarily the practical soul carer's demand for the unconditional "certainty" of the faith (the *foundations of faith!*) that lent this inner proof its great prominence. Where is there still an unconditionally firm ground for the faith, now that evil critics, including the free protestant theologians, have so painfully shaken the once so rocksteady faith in the authenticity of the new-testamentarian tradition through their investigations? – thus asks the simple Christian. *On your inside*, you still find this safe ground of faith – the soul carer responds to the doubting one. Simply test your christian heart: to him who has recognised himself as a lost sinner, and who has then suddenly experienced the rescuing mercy of the died and resurrected Christ-Jesus – not only this inner rebirth experience is immediately certain, but they also simultaneously and equally strongly perceive the certainty, that *Jesus lives and works!* "According to Frank, the experience of rebirth, with ethical and logical necessity, first reassures the Christian of the reality of certain immanent, i.e. inner ongoings (sin, to be free of guilt...), and beyond that, of the in themselves active transcendent causalities (god, trinity, Christ's atonement...)"⁶⁹ In this description, the following cause-and-effect chain becomes visible: Jesus still works within me today – he who works must "live" – Jesus lives as an "elevated Christ" – if Jesus is elevated by god's right-hand side, he must have once been resurrected – thus, Jesus has died before his resurrection – he who has died must have previously lived: it thus follows that Jesus has once "really" lived as a human being on Earth! – There would still be *M Keim* and *W Herrmann* to be mentioned as theologians of such "inner experience". *Keim*, like *Herrmann*, is "indifferent towards the potential" historical doubts regarding Jesus' life circumstances: "What to him [to

the faithful, presumably] *is crucial in the man of Nazareth, stands before his consciousness in immediate, well unswerving inner certainty and clarity.*"⁷⁰

On that, this is to be said: this subjective experience proof is based upon an obvious false conclusion. Nobody will doubt that experiences of the described kind have an immediate character of reality for the relevant individual. We are dealing with inner, i.e. physiological-psychological ongoing which are ultimately almost always triggered by "external" causes however; be it by experiences of the individual in the environment, be it by reading religious writings, by a sermon or miscellaneous measures of the soul-carer. Thus, the subjective experience indeed points beyond the individual into the reality of the objective world. We must now have a more accurate look at the situation however. Which momentum presents itself as external (objective) reality (cause), when for example a Christian experiences their "rebirth" through bible lecture? Ultimately, the objective root cause is the existence of a certain book: the bible! Certain stories reported in the bible evoke emotionally emphasized ideas which are active at such strength, so that the christian act of atonement is triggered at the given moment. Now, as we can learn on a daily basis, it is a truism, that even *invented* stories – provided that their truthfulness (historical authenticity) is believed – can evoke inner experiences of the described kind. Think of the experiences of edification evoked by the legends of saints. What follows from that? That inner experiences, regardless of how strong and certain they are for the experiencing individual, can and must *not out of themselves* be used as proof for objective authenticity of the reported events, or the *historicity* of potentially mentioned persons, respectively. In every case, the proof for the historicity of a named person must by all means be delivered in a totally different (namely, the historical!) way. Even the belief in an totally invented person can cause "inner experiences".

2. The momentum of "possibility" as a means of proof

Even our old-school historians – who famously even still today, principally handle the venerable *relativistic* monks' method in their examination of sources – cannot always avoid, in the passion of critique, occasionally consulting the *absolute* method for support as well. If they are thoroughly stuck, as is the case almost regularly, then, the else not at all rated absolute method must play the saviour from peril. Every time when there is no progressing with the old method in the monstrous thicket of the mutually contradicting source statements, they submit to once trying the method of experience for a change. However, it is only on historical trifles that our historians mention absolute critique; never will experts dare discuss and solve perhaps a historical overall problem by methodical use of experience. This is the difference between the relativists and myself: I accept the relative method only as a preliminary step for the temporary orientation within the source material, but as critical test means for establishing authenticity, I use, principally and at every point, in the big and the small, the absolute method; those [relativists], on the other hand, work principally with their relative method, and only occasionally, and only in the small things, their last resort is the shelter of the absolute critique.

Again, what is the "absolute" type of question? This: whether something is (psychologically) *possible*? However, possibility and impossibility are decided upon by *living experience*. I present two axioms:

First axiom: the on the basis of objective experience proven *possibility* of a fact can never prove the factual *reality* of an allegedly historical fact (of the same kind). The proven possibility merely proves that the relevant event would have also been possible under the named circumstances in the past. However, there is a deep gap between (historical) possibility and reality. Even if the possibility of a reported fact has to be admitted, it is

unavoidable to yet still deliver proof by historical-critical means that *once*, the fact has *really* occurred! The evidence of the plain possibility merely subjectively strengthens the belief in the factuality of the alleged historical event, but it never replaces the still awaited objective proof for the "factual" reality of a reported particular case. On the other hand, things are different with the

second axiom: if it is positively proven by objective experience, that a purported *psychological* fact is absolutely *impossible*, then it follows from such statement, that the fact in question has been impossible in *every* case, in previous cases as well, i.e. that the reported alleged event could *never* have been historical fact. The conclusion from the impossibility of experiences to the historical impossibility is immediate and imperative. By the way, *Arthur Drews* and *Van den Bergh van Eysinga* have already had cause to point out to the theologist researchers the first axiom of the absolute critique, particularly with regards to the reports of biblical miracles. Even a theologist, *P Kalweit*, has correctly recognised the situation here, when he writes: "*If for example perhaps the systematical theology... had to admit the possibility of the wonder, then on that basis, the historical theology would not be permitted to say in a particular case: the miracle is possible, thus, this particular miracle that is being reported, is true. That would be nothing but a false conclusion.*"⁷¹

3. The momentum of the "uninventability"^{XXXII} as a means of proof

a) The by *Kalweit* quoted pseudo-proof, whose naivety lay not always quite openly in daylight however, enjoys great popularity with the critics of the new-testamentarian "history", and we find details of it on almost every page of their discussions. The most reckless conclusion: "uninventable" and therefore "historically authentic", is preferably spread in connection with the preamble: because the relevant event is so *vividly* described!

XXXII 'uninventability' = the impossibility of being invented; self-explanatory, no?

With many researchers, *vividness* per se, and purely automatically, assumes a joint experience and the being eyewitnessed, or at least "local tradition", of what is reported. What is described so uncommonly vividly, and with such concrete details – so these researchers reckon, it cannot be plucked from thin air. Again and again, especially the mention of *names* and *dates* is impressive as an authenticity characteristic. For example, almost all critics are fascinated by the "authenticity", when in the Acts, they find the "concrete" detail, that Peter has lived in Joppe with a tanner, Simon in a house close by the sea. As if historicising poets could not with ease invent concrete names and dates! They are even forced – if they intend to foist their novel on the co-world or posterity as a real historical narrative – to give concrete details of all kinds, if they want to lend their fiction the appearance of historical authenticity. Why, have the relevant learned theologians not yet read books which the public usually calls "novels"? Evidently, their wondrous opinion proposes that it were impossible that poets could also simply invent concrete descriptions of events that have the same effect as eyewitness reports. Naturally, the theologians now patronise me: with the "historical" books of the NT, this is an entirely different matter. The four gospels and the Acts simply are no novels, but history books! If I now ask: by what must it be concluded that for example the Acts are a report on real happenings, on real historical facts? – then those researchers have the cheek to reply: among other indications, this is proven by certain most "vivid" elements that can only be traced to eyewitness reports. These men go in circles, and they do not notice that they are doing it.^{XXXIII} *"The actually historical pieces"* – or so *Th Zahn* assures us with touching naivety – *"are secured against the suspicion of later invention by location details, by persons' names, by difficult to invent character traits, by... genuine Israelite hue."*⁷², ^{XXXIV}

XXXIII Begging to differ: they know very well what they're doing, and I'm afraid they're doing a marvellous job, from their point of view.

XXXIV If anything, this 'genuine hue' vouches for the exact opposite of course. (A look at Zahn's work, in so many volumes, and so many pages, and we should readily perceive whence this wind is blowing.) This entire section is quite superfluous anyhow, when viewed soberly. Going by some of these 'theologians', every story/book/film should be viewed as authentic history, because writers have a way with words, and because film makers have a way with 'vividness'!?! Try *The greatest story ever told*, this '1965' 3-hours-plus Hollywood

Sometimes, the blind faith goes that far, that theologians go to the pains of a journey into the Orient, in order to have themselves convinced of the "factual authenticity" of the biblical tellings by the immediate observation of the Palestinian environment.⁷³ With the best of will, it can no longer be taken seriously, when the archaeologist *E Curtius* – in order to prove Paul's speech in Athens as authentic, although it has been declared a fictional composition by most of the theological critics – amongst others things, proclaims: "*One has to be at home in Athens in order to quite understand the report.*"⁷⁴ [Archaeologist, huh? The sheer nerve...]

In the following version, the proof by uninventability is a little more difficult to detect. Regardless of how many concrete details of Jesus' life may "perhaps" have been invented – or so this new thesis goes – *the high figure of Jesus* per se, and the incomparable, religious-ethical essence of his proclamation are uninventable at any rate! "*Had not the shattering reality ... broadly painted this life of Jesus onto Galilee's soil, never could a human brain invent such a life, nor could any human art compose it.*"⁷⁵ [Oh, dear...] So, the theologians believe that with this argument, they hold such a convincing weapon of evidence in their hands, that according to their view, no denier of Jesus' historicity will be able to withstand the thrust of this proof. It is now certainly equally as understandable as it goes without saying, that when faithful Christians, preferentially in their capacity as apologists, praise the alleged founder of their religion as something absolutely "incomparable"; it must be asked however, whether such subjective conviction is based upon a sufficiently objective (historical) root cause as well? I could now, merely by a small hint on certain results of critical theology, make the belief in the uninventability of the Jesus figure totter precariously. As is well-known, there are enough theologians who declare especially the particularly excellent character traits in the image of the biblical Jesus products of the later "*community legend*". The divine glory, of all things – I mention the birth legends and the "myths"

ream - how authentic, how vivid, no? What in the blue blazes...

regarding the resurrection, the apparitions and the ascension – has been, according to these researchers' opinion, subsequently woven around the person of the "historical" Jesus by the fictionalising community legend. Thus, according to many theologians' judgement, the in the NT painted Jesus figure has, to an essential degree – been invented! Why, more still: all theologians even know a prominent *fictionist* regarding the allegedly uninventable Jesus words, namely the evangelist John. The author of Jesus' "incomparable" speeches in the fourth gospel supposedly has, congeniously immersing himself into Christ's nature, freely invented them. And even a biblical philosopher (religious theoretician), namely Paul, has by his brilliant speculation on the christian work of redemption and the redeemer figure significantly added to having the in the gospels appearing image of the saviour radiate a divine lustre. In a word: the allegedly uninventable Jesus figure including its proclamation of words is, in many theologians' view, at least in part invented yet, or has been compiled by all sorts of ideas of the religious environment, respectively. However, these results still assume a historical figure at the core onto which the noble rust of the later invented character traits has supposedly precipitated. This historical core is supposedly preserved in the most unspoiled fashion in the first three gospels, the so-called synoptical gospels. Now, my examinations refer to exactly this alleged historical core.

Is this core really uninventable? Indeed it is, we are reassured by *A Beyer*, who contents himself with the hint at the simple "fact", that of course "*behind the sayings as handed down by Jesus, there must stand a historical personality, because else, those very sayings would not exist.*"⁷⁶ [Do we really have to discuss this?!] More naivety can never exist! Nonetheless, we want to take this simplicity seriously, and for that reason remark: since in the synoptical gospels, according to but all critical theologians, there are certain hearty sayings by Jesus that cannot be accounted to the community legend, there must be a historical personality that has existed, namely Jesus of Nazareth who has uttered those sayings. From

where else should these sayings come?? This thesis sounds right nice [no, it doesn't!], and it makes a big impression on uncritical minds, too; but on closer inspection, the argument reveals itself to be a fundamental error. Namely, experience teaches us sufficiently audibly, that not only alleged utterances of real historical figures get invented, but that a well versed writer can effortlessly both: "pluck from thin air" utterances of a person and the person itself! Every novel delivers proof for this.

Just exactly why should it have been completely impossible to invent the figure of the biblical Jesus and his sayings even in the core? Nobody will want to claim that it was poets of the fields, woods and meadows and twisted philosophers who should have, like out of nowhere, at some time, in some place, had the idea to draft a Christ novel, or better: the Christ novel presented to us in the NT. The evangelical story is not the product of chance, or a literary product of idleness; for that, it has been set up and carried out far too planfully. The reflexion of the sharpest collective mental work is hovering above the waters as the spirit of the new-testamentarian literature! Root causes of the most imperative kind – which will concern us only later however – have been at work. At the beginning, there stood a desire; and an imperative awoke the will to action which had to progress purposefully and systematically, if the action should make any sense instead of being an idle sport. So, I ask: is it impossible to invent stories of Gods? For example, one in which it is told how a God in human appearance wandered and worked on Earth? Answer: no; to think such things up, and then carry them out is per se child's play, and has happened often, as is well-known. I ask further: is it impossible to get the idea of having the Jewish god Jahve operate on Earth in the shape of a human being, by making him the humanised hero of a "novel"? Answer: no! To think up such a variation of the popular stories of Gods with a concrete reference to Jahve is not at all difficult, especially when there is a desire pointing in that direction. Next: is it impossible to get the idea of decorating this Jahve story, so that it would proclaim certain

religious-ethical tendencies? No! Again, this is very easily possible. Next: is it impossible to compact this tendency, or to specify it, respectively, so that the drafted god-human Jahve appears as the rescuer of humans (primarily his people)^{xxxv} from peril, i.e. as an emergency helper, as a saviour? No; to invent such specifics is not at all difficult, especially considering that this is of course about Jahve. Next: is it impossible to concretely specify the stories to be invented so, that they have an edifying effect; in particular, that the godly-human hero is presented as teacher on divine-religious issues, as an admonisher on ethical issues, and even as an example of someone truly faithful, and as such, plays a part in fictionalised events? Oh no! For brilliant writers in connection with philosophical thinkers, such concrete story-writing is offhand possible. Next: is it impossible to get the idea of proclaiming the god-human, working on Earth as saviour, as the "son" of Jahve? Not at all; this thought is fairly obvious, and it will easily come out on contemplation. Namely, if the god-human – it has to only be mentioned that it is in fact quite easy to give them a name (Jesus) – has to serve as a historical example with regards to the relationship of humans to "God", then Jahve must invariably be "split", then a main- and a sub-God (simply a "divine" human) must be proclaimed. God simply cannot want to be his own ideal! Thus, the split of the Jahve deity into father and son is uncommonly obvious, and it can easily be invented by philosophical writers and theologians. And now, we come to the actual central question. Is it impossible to invent the "unique" religious highness of the biblical Jesus? Namely the highness which makes itself known through the "special" relationship of the on Earth working split-God (son of God) to his heavenly father? Oh no! Because again, the religious special status and uniqueness necessarily follows from the father-son-relationship. After all, how can we have a loyal, loving, obedient son talk of their father other than in a loving and faithful, soulful tone?! And now the last question: is the "unique" highness of Jesus' proclamations in ethical

XXXV Never mind 'primarily', it should read 'exclusively', because humans per se mean nothing to 'Jahve' (read: 'Satan') in the OT, except as slaughter victims, if only *someone* were to read it properly...

regards uninventable? Answer: this highness, too, is very easily invented. On the one hand, the philosopher writers of the Jesus story only had to "utilise" the religions and philosophers of the whole world, and transfer their ethically high values onto Jesus; on the other hand, they only had to employ the tactics of enhancing, of going over the top with the acuteness of the ethical commands of the old-testamentarian Sinai God. In particular, smart philosophers find it not at all difficult to considerably enhance the strictness of the ethical commands by: "internalising" them, i.e by placing even the impulses and processes of thought under the ethical law. (I am referring to the high tensions of the ethical maxims of many philosophers – e.g. Kant's Categorical Imperative – and I particularly point out that Nietzsche has necessarily invented a new "uniqueness" by the schematic tactics of rearranging the christian ethical values, or their "reversal", respectively.)

The above analysis has thus established, that even the core mass of the Jesus figure and Jesus story is not uninventable, but that it could be very easily conceived by a society of clever men (writers and philosophers)

b) In the garden of the theological critique, there is another variety of the uninventability proof sprouting which we want to briefly discuss at the end. Several times in the evangelical story, Jesus and his apostles are reported upon *unfavourably*. Theologians triumphantly point to such places and declare: such attributes offensive to Christians are the best proof for the historical authenticity and truthfulness of the tradition, because if the gospels were fiction, then the forging fictionists would of course certainly not have invented unfavourable things about Jesus and the disciples!^{XXXVI} A favoured example is the denial of Peter, or the detail, that Jesus, the celebrated miracle man, can effect no miracles in his home

XXXVI "When wanting to prove to your enemy, that you're one of them, nothing is more convincing than shooting one of your own before their eyes." I once picked this truism up – in a Hollywood movie, wouldn't you know it.

town. It is very worrying, if some theologians betray their weakness with such arguments even in their very own realm, the systematical theology. How else could they find the report, that Jesus was unable to effect miracles in Nazareth, strange and offensive? Well-consideredly, Mark reports that Jesus was unable to effect miracles in his home town, because he found no faith there. Now, does not one axiom of the new-testamentarian theology say, that for the success and the occurrence of the miracle healing on the part of the help-seeking, faith is an unconditional prerequisite? According to this, it is only logical – and for all believers right educational – that even Jesus could simply effect no miracles when the faith was missing. Yet, it is especially this, that the author of the gospel intended: to demonstrate by a concrete example the absolute necessity of faith. How then could the enormous significance of faith be better demonstrated than by a *negative* example. Especially from the unfavourable things, the reader was to draw a salubrious lesson. Here, nothing is offensive to a faithful soul, equally as it is inoffensive to any Christian, in the fact that Jesus has humiliated himself up to the cross, and died on the stake of shame. It is equally as inoffensive, that Jesus (God) cannot save a *non-believer* and make them happy.

By the way, the "first" Christians could simply not have taken any offence, because they have not even existed! Invented persons cannot be edified, nor be offended, by invented events. [*Only* by invented events!] This is what the late medieval gospel inventors said to themselves, and they were thus permitted to confidently conceive "offensive" stories, if in that manner invented stone of contention could serve, and was at the same time meant to serve to an outstanding extent as a historicised means for the admonition and edification of the faithful readers. However, that the deliberate tactics of occasionally reporting really unfavourable things about the hero of a novel downright represents a characteristic of the late medieval history falsification action, is known by all readers of my previous writings. I particularly refer to the discourses in the book "The Founders of the Roman Universal

Church", where the reason for these popular and useful tactics have been clarified as well.⁷⁷ Nothing of course strengthens the appearance of historical authenticity of falsified history so very much as the deliberate use of the tactics of occasionally reporting unfavourable things about the hero of the pseudo-historical novel. Each "real" picture has to simply show some shadows as well, in order to be perceived as real; and the evangelical history shall and must be perceived as real history, else it is soon over with the trust in the "historical fact" of the christian revelation even amongst the circle of the faithfuls. Thus, the uninventability-pseudo-proof as well, together with all its modifications, has collapsed.

II. Miscellaneous on the alleged events and the humans in the primeval community

As the title of the here presented overall book "*The Falsification of the History of Primeval Christianity*" indicates, I intend to deliver proof by a series of investigations, that the primevally christian "history" is not real history, but historicised purpose fiction. Essentially, the "history" of primeval Christianity is presented in the four *gospels* and the *Acts*. So, it is these portions of the NT that will predominantly be the subject of my investigations.

Much depends on *where* and *how* the critical leverage is used in the "historical" complex of sources. However, most depends on *which* lever is used, i.e. everything depends on the *method* of critique. The historian is as good as their method is worth. Certainly, even relative altitude measurements are not meaningless, but only measurements referring to sea level have an absolute worth. And the question of historical authenticity simply does not have

a relative, but an absolute character. Only a method of critique that has the required absolute point of reference, can be deemed fit to decisively and ultimately solve questions of authenticity. (For new readers, it may not go amiss to once more point out the most essential attribute of my absolute method: critique's reference point, the sea level, to which all authenticity measurements refer, is the living experience, that is, the *psychological*^{XXXVII} general experience. My critical question is this: is an event reported as allegedly historical, or the report itself, respectively, *possible* or *impossible* according to psychological experience? In this, the in the previous chapter postulated methodical axioms are to be noted, according to which, establishing a possibility does not yet by any means guarantee the historical reality and authenticity, but instead, simply establishing the impossibility by experience necessarily means the historical impossibility, i.e. non-historicity.)

Now, where do I best apply the lever of absolute critique in the "historical" material of primeval Christianity? The only prerequisite accepted by us as unbiased historians consists of preliminarily facing the handed-down allegedly historical material as if it were historically authentic. Potential inauthenticity has to first be established of course, i.e. it must not already be assumed.

So, where do I apply the lever? This question is answered by the simple consideration, that it would not be very useful to first examine the end result, that which has formed (namely the gospel already fixed *in writing*), and afterwards, the incomplete thing, the forming thing (namely the forming Jesus tradition in its transient stage of the *oral* tradition). Assuming that the new-testamentarian history has formed "naturally", it is suggested by the nature of the

XXXVII Fortunately, it's not limited to psychology, but instead, this is all-encompassing logic, quite independent from and above psychology, quite practical also: e.g. source A states: "...hijackers have flown planes into buildings, say, on the 11th of September '2001'..."; naturally-logically, those "hijackers" would have died instantly, together with all other passengers and crew – source B, 3 days later, states: "Persons A, B, C, D etc., all identified as "hijackers" from source A, are alive and well in this and that place." – Source B can be checked, proves to be true. It follows irrefutably that source A is lying. – *This* is what the 'absolute method' is.

subject to first thoroughly view the alleged formation of the tradition, its pre-literary fate, its oral stage. Thus, the "oral" gospel will be the first attack point for the leverage.

Up to two decades ago, the today existing complete gospels, i.e. the Jesus story already fixed in writing, formed the subject of examination for most of the researchers of Jesus's life. The researchers have of course always realised, that the Jesus story – its natural formation assumed – had gone around from mouth to mouth before its first-time being written down. This oral stage is "embodied", in a manner of speaking, in the "*community legend*". This is to be imagined as the earliest state of the orally disseminated "story" of Jesus in the primeval community at a time, when the "genuine" core was already entwined with and interspersed by tales, legends and myths... However, the attention of the older researchers did not so much stretch to the first pre-literary stage, but much rather to the second intermediate-literary stage of the oral tradition. We are to observe especially the literary work of the community legend in the period between the writing down of the first gospel up to it being fixed in the fourth gospel. But it has been neglected to first form a vivid idea of the stage of the oral-ity itself. One thing is certain: if the oral tradition of the evangelical history has supposedly *formed naturally*, then its formation must have occurred following natural (psychological) laws.

Oral knowledge and dissemination of historical events is the work of human beings. *We must therefore meet the relevant people and their environment, if we want to study the masses of the tradition that form among them, and are passed around them from mouth to mouth.* Assuming that Jesus is a historical person, then it goes without saying, that the knowledge of his life as well as the sayings uttered by him remained alive in the circle of his disciples and miscellaneous followers as a delicious, not-to-be-lost possession. Not only the followers however, but the *opponents*, too, retained an indelible memory of the sensational

"shameful" events around the personage of the criminal, who was sentenced to the cross, who had himself called Messiah. We would now like to meet these followers and opponents; and it is so splendidly suited for this, that in the NT, there is also a script handed down whose explicit task it is, to tell the "history" of the christian primeval community (and the first Pagan mission). This script calls itself *Acts*.

Through the golden gate of the Acts, we now enter the wonderland of the first Christians. It really is a wonderland that spreads before our mental eye: angels consort with humans, and save them from threatening dangers. Why, even God himself interferes in the run of events with miracle actions. If the geographical environment were not so convincingly "genuine" Palestinian, the bold thought could occur to us, that this wonderland of primeval Christianity may not be found on Earth, but somewhere above the sea of clouds. Behold however, Luke, the alleged author of the Acts, assures us that he is describing "facts", that he has carried out accurate investigations amongst reliable witnesses on the truth of the facts! [*rolleyes*] So, let us just *temporarily* take the Acts as the truthful description of the "history" of first Christianity. Which are the *main facts* reported by Luke? (In the following list, I quietly push those circumstances and facts to the foreground that later become significant during our critical assessment of the oral tradition.)

The golden gate of the Acts is Christ's ascension. Jesus has risen from the dead, Luke reports according to "secure" tradition, and after his resurrection, he has still been seen by his disciples for 40 days, after which he has parted from them forever, and has been "elevated" to Jahve's right-hand side. Before that, the Lord has still ordered the disciples to not leave Jerusalem, but to wait there for the "promise of the father". The latter then indeed came to the eleven disciples (Judas, the traitor, had of course been eliminated), on Whitsuntide: the holy ghost is poured into their souls, and this would very soon come out in a spectacular language

miracle. It is counted as a success of a speech of Peter, that the initially only 120 souls strong followership is enlarged in one stroke by 3000 turned-faithful ones. One portion of this first christian missionary speech is highly interesting, namely the by Peter produced evidence of truth for the factual resurrection of the passed away human being Jesus. Without the firm and quite certain and secure belief in Jesus' resurrection (and elevation), it would have indeed – always assuming Jesus' historicity – never come to a unity and community amongst the disciples of course, and thus never to a formation of a christian community and a church. Now, what is this resurrection proof of Peter? At first and quite briefly, the apostle mentions the "testimony", which all of them, namely the disciples, could give for the truth of the resurrection, and then – what do you know? – he presents a naive pseudo-proof of the most modern kind: the inner experience! Afterwards as well, Peter uses in a peculiar modification the proof of the inner experience once again. We will have to discuss this more thoroughly in a later chapter.

We are keen to hear from Luke, what he has to report on the statement of Jesus' previous opponents about the now suddenly renewed, and this time allegedly so successfully beginning missionary work of the disciples. Because the events did not occur in some corner, but in broad public. Peculiarly, the old opponents, the Pharisees as well, placed no particular significance on the new christian sect for the time being: at first, the preaching disciples are calmly tolerated. The author of the gospel however, knows a reason for this tolerance and patience of the opponents. Namely, the new Christ believers, and even the apostles themselves, did not separate themselves from the Jewish religious community, but before as now, they strictly lived according to the customs of devout Jews, kept the laws, and regularly gathered in the temple for prayer. Only for "breaking bread", in remembrance of their old board community with Jesus, the apostles and followers privately assembled in their houses. With these details, Luke intends to imply an explanation: that, and why, the Jewish

authorities did not actually have any reason to proceed against this innocent "Jewish" sect of the Christians. However, the soon after occurring wondrous healing of a lame one and the subsequent public speech of the miracle worker Peter yet evoked the first clash with the authorities now. The arrested Peter takes this opportunity to make his stance before the synedrion^{xxxviii} with his proof "by experience". Although the members of the high council can "say nothing" against such line of evidence, they nonetheless order the apostles: to simply not make themselves heard in future, or teach anything under naming the name of Jesus. Luke carries on reporting that it goes without saying that the apostles did not mind the prohibition, they much rather carried on openly teaching and healing "in the name of Jesus", got arrested again, all of them this time, but were liberated from prison by an angel.^{xxxix} Still on the morning of this wondrous liberation, the disciples "openly" preach again in the temple, are arrested yet again, but they are not liberated this time, but they evade the death sentence only by the unexpected intercession of the influential Pharisee Gamaliel, who also manages to pacify the members of the Sadduceean party. It is striking anyhow, that not the Pharisees, but the Sadducees are presented as the actual opponents of the Christ confessors, that is, as Luke says, because they, as principle deniers of the fleshly resurrection, were grumbling at the apostles with their belief of Jesus' resurrection.

According to Luke, the toleration of the ever growing christian community in Jerusalem continues, until the Hellenistic Christian Stephanus evokes a catastrophe by openheartedly speaking against the Jewish law. In this, we hear for the first time, that the primeval community consisted of two "groups": the (christian) Hebrews and the (christian) Hellenists.

XXXVIII Synedrion: supposedly over 2200 year-old supreme Jewish authority of 71 members chaired by the high priest, supposedly way different to the 'Sanhedrin' of any other era, also consisting of 71 members with – the almost exact same name. It's what the '1928'-'35' Brockhaus 17000-page encyclopedia says. It also says that this council was even consulted by the ruling Romans prior to passing/executing any sentence!!! Tellingly, KJ simply calls it 'sanhedrin' – no differentiation there. So much for the 'Nazi'-Brockhaus...

XXXIX Riiight... As a 6-year old, during my first RE 'lessons', one word sprang to my little mind: "Märchenstunde!" ["Fairy tale hour!"]

The former were the from old in Jerusalem living, Hebrew-Aramaic speaking Jews; Hellenists are foreign-born, mostly Greek-speaking Jews, who have later moved to the holy temple town Jerusalem however, in order to live out their life here. That despite all the unity within the new faith, there was no lack of differences between the two groups either, is suggested by the Hellenists' accusation, that their widows are "overlooked" by the Hebrews during the daily rationing from the community funds, a grievance that is eliminated only by special measures of the apostles. Since Stephanus denies the future validity of the Jewish law and temple cult even in his defense speech, he gets himself stoned by the outraged public crowd, and subsequently, the whole christian community is persecuted and driven out of Jerusalem. "All" Christians, it is reported, were driven away, only the *apostles* have been brave (!) enough to remain in Jerusalem despite all dangers. How are we to imagine this? Probably to the effect of course, that the apostles, i.e. the leaders of the Jerusalem christian community, were *not* persecuted! Many researchers explain this to the effect, that this persecution was essentially simply aimed against the Hellenistic group (not the Hebrew-Christians to which the apostles counted). As *E Meyer* reckons: "*This shows that the opposition between the Hebrew and the Hellenistic faithfuls has been deeper than Luke portrays it; despite all efforts to retain the unity, a split within the community occurred that has subsequently been carried ever further.*"⁷⁸ However, to the primeval community, the Jerusalem catastrophe means only a brief misfortune, and else, it effects the most fortunate consequences for the further development of the christian church. Because now, the driven-out ones form new communities in the whole land Judaea, then also in Samaria and beyond. It is remarkable that preliminarily, *only Jews* were admitted into the christian communities. According to Luke's description, the thought that even Pagans could be, and would have to be admitted to the gospel, was so inconceivable, that Jahve himself had to intervene. In a

"vision", Jahve gives Peter the explicit order to baptise a Pagan (the Captain Cornelius), and to admit him into the christian community.

For our purpose, it is unnecessary to list still more news on the fate of the Jerusalem primeval community from the Acts. The news is sufficient that in the primeval community, the opposition between the law-abiding group of Christians and the group of those free from the law has intermittently become very tense, and that during the course of a later persecution of the Christians, all primeval apostles "disappear" from Jerusalem.

Our preliminary goal is reached: the reader has equally met the soil of the soul's field into which Jesus' words and deeds have been planted as seeds, and from which the plant of the oral tradition has subsequently sprouted. We have been able to study the terrain, the environment, and we are now all the more equipped to appreciate and assess the gospel in its pre- and interliterary sphere of existence. Thus, we now turn our whole attention to the problems of the oral gospel.

Again, always assuming that Jesus is a historical person, and the new-testamentarian tradition of his Earthly wandering is historical at least in its core – then the master's death could of course not have simultaneously effected the death of each *memory* of him. To the contrary, especially the tragic ending should have immensely sharpened the memory of this life, and made it more vivid. Predominantly of course in the hearts of the disciples, where "disciples" does not merely denote the eleven (apostles), but also the wider circle of Jesus' first followers. Like with a fiery pencil have the sayings and deeds of Jesus, whom to accompany some of them were permitted almost daily, been written into their memories. Truly, had Jesus lived and worked in the way the gospels are announcing it: then after his passing away, the most vivid memory of such an exceptional human being should have remained alive in the whole Jewish land. For example, could the many men and women

healed by the miracle man from Nazareth have ever forgotten time and place and other main circumstances of their healing during their entire further life? Never! All essential circumstances and some of Jesus' words therein spoken must have remained present for life in the numerous witnesses of such miracle healings as well. After all, according to the evangelists' description, how [well] this prophet understood to speak! Forcefully, and not like the scribes! Had this Nazarene worked for ten or more years however, then it would have been difficult after his death to properly distinguish the uncounted events of his life in memory, and to group them in the correct chronological order. Fortunately, that was not the case. Jesus' public workings only stretched over a period of one to three years. In addition, it has to be considered that the most significant ongoings were supposedly happening before all eyes in broadest public. *"These things did not happen in the corner"*, Paul emphasises, and he takes it for granted, *that all Jews, at least by hearsay, have been informed on the most important things in Jesus' life*. If we speak of the memory of Jesus however, we must not overlook especially that class of Jews within whom the memory of the crucified "criminal" was as deeply engrained as within the disciples: namely within the *opponents*! The passionate opponent forgets equally as little as the passionate follower does! Even if the disciples had once enjoyed "forgetting", or even essentially "modifying" any important, yet unpleasant event from the public life of the master: their plan would have failed, and they could not have rid the world of the "truth" – the good memory of the opponents alone would have made sure of that.

We now mentally enter the above described environment of the primevally christian circle of apostles to Jerusalem, and follow the events as if they had happened really and historically. For the first time on this memorable Whitsuntide, the apostles have made public propaganda for their Christ belief. They now have to carry on performing further faith work on the newly converted, introduce them ever more deeply into the big secret of the messiah

belief through catechism and instruction. And these apostles, in their missionary ardour, want to gain ever more compatriots, why, all Jews, for their faith, and they must therefore approach the masses ever anew with their speeches of admonition and conversion. In this, every speech, every sermon, every catechism culminates in an outrageous claim, sounding out in the cry of joy: this elevated Christ in whom we must believe, is none other than – Jesus of Nazareth, the man whom you have dismissed! So, with each sermon and catechism, the listener is ever again made aware of the *human being Jesus*, i.e. of his words and deeds. Some listeners already know much, but many do not yet know much that is "certain" of this unique human being, besides the crucifixion and some miracle healings. All, especially the newly converted, want to know more, possibly everything *about the Earthly career* of the "messiah". Now, the apostles can of course not spread their entire treasure of experience before the community every time: they must select, they must – following the requirements of the day – strongly recommend to the faithfuls this or that religious-ethical command of the master, this or that power deed of his life. It thus follows from the requirements of the community, that certain deeds and sayings of Jesus have been "updated" from memory.

"In the beginning stood the sermon", as *M Dibelius* attempts to express the situation. On a daily basis, sermon and catechism and mission propaganda give the impulse to the coming alive of the Jesus tradition. Not to be forgotten at all: the unavoidable debates with the opponents constantly give such impulses as well. In this, it has to always be realised, that the primevally christian community was in exigency, that is, under the imperative of that axiom which causes all theologians the greatest worry especially in most recent times again: *the inseparable connection of the Christ belief and "historical" facts!* From the first day on, Christianity – always assuming that Jesus is a historical person – found itself forged to "history" with objective chains. In the moment in which the disciples were preaching to the co-world a *human being*, just this Jesus of Nazareth, as saviour and elevated Christ, the

"historical" chains were forged, and the new religion was inseparably connected to history, and has become a religion of history. In this connection of faith and "history" lay the centre of gravity and the uniqueness of the christian religion. Not some fantasy figure, not a God of legends, not an invented mystery being, no, *this human being, this Jesus*, is our (and your!) saviour and Christ – thus, allegedly, the news of the primeval apostles sounded in all places of Jerusalem. Everywhere, the apostles proclaimed: not our fantasy, no – but reality, history testifies in our favour, for our Christ claims. *We want to advertise with real history!* Not with invented or falsified history! The factual Jesus story is our, the apostles', most noble and most effective means of proof and conviction.

Had Jesus really lived, each sermon and propaganda speech of the first Christians would have culminated in these "*historical*" statements of proof.

Smart theologists can now "prove" to me (in their paper-made and relativistic way!), that in primeval Christianity, the "historical" facts of Jesus' life have by no means given the just previously emphasised great significance. They refer me to the "very oldest" new-testamentarian sources, the letters of Paul. Assuming that these letters were authentic, and Paul were a figure of history, then indeed, these epistles and community circulars would be most precious for all sorts of questions of primevally christian life. Paul himself however, even in his longest letters, mentions conspicuously few details and circumstances from the Earthly life of the messiah. Why, Paul explicitly declares that "by the flesh", Jesus did not mean much, actually nothing to him. Quite right: in Paul's *speculative theology*, in his religious-philosophical system of "justification" (not by the law, but by the faith), the "bodily Jesus" finds little room. In *this* theology, everything revolves around death, resurrection and elevation, i.e. merely the final facts of the redeemer's Earthly life. Now, the theologists' above reference to Paul means punching air, nonetheless. Firstly: since in his letters, Paul – besides

his rules for community discipline – is again and again striving to clarify the outline of "his" gospel (i.e. his speculative theology), he finds of course little "actual" cause to fill the pages of his circulars with column-long reports of Jesus' deeds and utterances. Secondly: these epistles are merely strengthening and deepening the faith, they are addressed to, in a manner of speaking, the advanced class, not to faith novices. Thus, they already assume much, of course primarily the already previously orally communicated closer acquaintance with the life details and utterances of the "bodily" Jesus. Or are we to assume that on the foundation of a new community, Paul has said: I (the philosophy of my religion!) am [/is] not interested in the bodily Jesus, so it is none of your business, either? When the newly converted were eager to hear, just why the good saviour had been crucified, or whether he had perhaps lived the life of a regular human being, and what he had said on prayer, charity, marriage and equally as important matters? – then a Paul or a Peter should have abruptly waved off? Perhaps accompanied by the reluctant remark: bah, such things are uninteresting? With that much disinterest in Jesus' Earthly life, the apostles would have simply converted no Jewish compatriot (and Paul no Pagan) to the christian faith. More than anything: no sensible reason existed of course, to not tell anything of the saviour's Earthly life. There was much rather a hundredweight of reasons to report *as much as possible* of the deeds and sayings. Because for the monstrous claim of the apostles, that *a passed away human has risen up again*, and has been elevated by Jahve to the latter's right-hand side, and has also been chosen as the sole saviour of mankind from eternal damnation – for such claims, there was only *one* "striking" proof: "history", i.e. the "salvation facts" of Jesus' Earthly life.

III. Oral tradition and community legend

Had the primeval apostles wanted to effectively shock the opposition in their hostile stance – and almost all the world in Jerusalem was opposition, had just rejected Jesus and his gospel, and shouted "crucify"! – then they would have inevitably been forced by the "historicity" of their proclaimed new faith to first and foremost testify by means of proof of the "historical facts" of Jesus' life to the veracity of their claims. The Acts explicitly emphasise in many places, that time and again, the apostles had indeed referenced the testimonial of the Jesus story. The disciples were aware, Paul narrates, that only *the truth of the communicated events* and sayings from Jesus' life could make an impression on the people. Therefore, the real, unadulterated tradition of Jesus had to form the main means of conviction at all times. With *fantasies* on an human being crucified as a criminal, whose public work has been in everybody's best memory, the first Christ proclaimers could have effected nothing; because their cause was a lost one in the moment, in which the Jerusalemers could have branded the disciples *liars*, and, it goes without saying, would have branded them, too. Thus, the mistrust of the enemies was the strongest motivation and the best drill sergeant to the truth. It is necessary that the reader gains absolute clarity on this point of truth by placing themselves into the "real" life of the first Christians according to the descriptions of the Acts. Had Jesus perhaps died as a mere miracle doctor and rabbi without demanding divine honours and entitlements after his death – nobody in Jerusalem would have gotten worked up, if later all sorts of legends and anecdotes on this peacefully in his grave resting human being had been passed around. The case of Jesus of Nazareth lay essentially different however; because his disciples claim about their master, that he is the son of God, and is inaugurated by Jahve as the saviour of the world! To remain indifferent on such proclamation was simply no longer possible. Assuming that all these wonderful things had only recently taken place *in real* life!

Since the disciples could under no circumstances permit to be ousted as liars, the presentation and preservation of the real, unadulterated Jesus tradition had to necessarily be the utmost important concern of these first Christ proclaimers. It all the more surprises, what we now get to hear from research, especially the form historians, on the nature and fate of the oral Jesus tradition within the primevally christian sphere. If we for example study the work by *R Bultmann* on the history of the synoptical tradition (with deliberate reference to our problem), we will feel like hit in the head; because the overall result of this form-historical research is this: *as early as from the first day of the primevally christian community, the real tradition of Jesus has been interspersed and overgrown by an incredibly quickly and strongly growing mass of "legends"!* But not only the form historians of today, but *D F Strauss*, and, more than anybody, *Bruno Bauer* have proposed this amazing "fact" for discussion as early as a hundred years ago. However, one merit of the form historians consists of the attempt to reveal how such overgrowth could have occurred, why, had to occur in the first place. Namely, the form historians seek to present this alienating phenomenon as natural, as inevitable, as if it were following natural laws. In short: they thoughtlessly place the "historical" Jesus tradition on the same level as the common prose of folklore and anecdotes, and they thus testify in a stark manner to their own absolute lack of a historical sense of reality. The following discourse will highlight this shortage even more evidently.

By setting out to declare the extreme intersperment of the "real" Jesus tradition with legend material established by the new-testamentarian research via the paper-made source material flat-out impossible (impossible in the real life of the first Christians) – I am being interrupted. The theologists are shouting at me: the experience which should of course be referenced in this case as well, does by no means speak for the impossibility, but for the possibility of such formation of legends around a historical personality. A thousandfold – or so I am patronised – experience proves, that very soon after the death of an eminent human

being, myth and legend have begun their busy work of transfiguring and interspersing the real tradition of a hero. Now, I am indeed not the fool wanting to deny this fact of experience. However, I have to point out, that we should beware of applying facts of experience indifferently and equally schematically and mechanically to all potential "cases" of history (or pseudo-history, respectively). The lid of experience must match the pot of the "historical" situation! (We have to completely rid ourselves of the habit of insisting on perhaps the many "historical" cases of experience of the Middle Ages, because the alleged history of the Middle Ages is, in truth, planfully constructed purpose fiction. For evidence, I refer to my two volumes *The Falsification of German History* and *The Truth of the History of the Late Middle Ages*.) So, medieval saint legends do not even enter play, since they are no product of a natural origin, but they are a purely literary (learned) product of the universal falsification action. We are thus left with the experience of modern legends as a yardstick for the alleged legend formation in the primeval community. But even with a little contemplation, we can recognise not only the difficulty, but the impropriety and impermissibility of this experience comparison. Assuming, Jesus had lived; would we now be permitted to relate "by experience" the modern saint and his environment to the messiah Jesus of Nazareth and his Palestinian environment? (Well understood: this is not about assessing the quality of the two persons, but the significance of the formation of the legend in both cases.) Without a question, legend (i.e. certain interested human beings) has uncommonly strongly transfigured and overgrown the real tradition of many saints of the last centuries. Well-told and well written saint stories fulfil to a high degree the intended purpose among the circle of faithfuls as well: to edify the souls. So, saint legends from more recent times serve purely internal purposes of a certain community, and here, they do not even present themselves with the *dogmatic demand of absolute credibility* in all details. Also, actual opponents, outsiders, who take offence by such "stories", have long not existed anymore. The educated world overlooks

such tradition overgrowth, and is no longer interested in subjecting the reality of such legends to an intense scrutinisation. So, the modern legend may confidently fictionalise as much as it wants: an already existing big, why, enormous community of faithfuls accepts, with pleasure and unchecked, such products as a splendid means of edification, while the non-believers do not in the slightest feel disturbed in their soulful peace by the introduction and existence of such tales. Is it really still required to point out, that the situation in Jerusalem back then, when the disciples supposedly confronted the Jews with their inflammatory proclamation of a crucified human being as the by God chosen saviour of mankind, can in no way be compared to the environment of modern saints? Still more unfortunate is the popular reference to the formation of tales and anecdotes with the modern Western heroes. Here, any comparison with the Jesus tradition is simply absurd.

It has become clear to us, that the question: is the claimed primevally christian overgrowth of the "real" Jesus tradition by a most ample formation of legends? – must in no case be answered schematically with any old experience of legends. The particularity and the "uniqueness" of the case have to be accounted for. The particular starting point (in the paper-made source material) demands the equivalent particular point of comparison (in the living experience). Thus, our question, more accurately specified, is this: *is it psychologically possible, that human beings (namely the apostles to Jerusalem), who wanted to, and who had to prove certain monstrous claims with real history (namely the "real" Jesus history), that these human beings themselves wickedly devalue, and ultimately utterly annihilate their "secure" means of proof by inventing legends?* The enormous weight of this question is best demonstrated with by the theologist critique's established circumstance, that the in the primeval community allegedly freely practised legend-isation has devoured to the core, and transformed into fiction, the "true" historical core of the Jesus tradition *as soon as over the course of one generation*. And all of this under the eyes of the most embittered opponents,

who were also most familiar with the "real" events! If these factors are considered (as effective in rough life), then there can be no doubt that the above question must be answered negatively.

With our theologist critics, besides some healing stories that can be explained "naturally", all drastic miracle reports stand under the justified suspicion of being fantasy products of the fictionalising community. Unfortunately, the theologists do not at all make it clear to themselves, what it means, that most miracles are supposedly legends. It would mean, that the first Christians have supposedly been indeed so stupid to devalue their most eminent means of proof, namely the "real" Jesus story, by all sorts of fantasy stories, and that they would have found faith with such obvious fairy tales among their opponents, who were well familiar with the "real" events! These miracle fairy tales must have already been invented very early, because the "first" writing evangelist Mark has "met" such things in the oral tradition already. *Jülicher* even particularly highlights this for us: "*We cannot at all imagine too early a beginning of... the deposit of this noble rust on the tradition.*"⁷⁹

This is just how they are, the evangelical (but also the profane) theologists: here, they establish an "alienating" phenomenon of the paper-made sources as a fact to be accepted, without asking themselves the question, whether the established fact is even possible at all as a segment of reality in living experience. Why, even catholic theologists show a decidedly greater sense of reality on this point, when it comes to producing support for the *complete authenticity* of the new-testamentarian tales, and if incidentally, such support can be extracted from experience, then the catholic scholars develop an admirable sense of experience and reality. So, I hand over to a catholic critic: "*They [the miracle reports; K.] are not only supported by the testimony of the four evangelists and their immediate trustees, but they stand upon the guarantee of all of Jesus' contemporaries who were familiar with the almighty*

workings of the saviour. Those were almost uncountable however. Jesus taught and worked not in secret... An immeasurable crowd of people followed him... And all the more the Pharisee opponents of the saviour! »The Pharisees and the scribes lay in wait for him«, the gospel tellingly states repeatedly when there is mention of his miracles... The present legend theory unjustly assumes, that Jesus' words and deeds have been inflated into grotesque miracle tales by the primevally christian tradition and literature, without anybody ordering this wicked game halted and revealing the insolent historical lies. Viewed in the light of the real circumstances, this assumption is purely inconceivable. It [the assumption] could be taken seriously only, if together with Christ, the entire generation of those contemporaries had died out, who have known, seen, heard him, and had made room for a new generation, who knew only few certain things about him. That is not the case, however."⁸⁰

Such strong reference to the real circumstances makes the absolute critic's heart rejoice. After all, it is true: the enemies of Jesus' disciples did not sleep, but they always, as we know from the Acts, lay in wait for him, in order to find a reason to annihilate the Christ believers; thus, the apostles had no choice but to restrain themselves, and to advertise only with the known (!) "real" history of their master. Should they even only occasionally have attempted dishing up lies publically, then in real life, it would have invariably been over with any success of their sermon. And the alleged legend inventors themselves would have also been smart enough to realise the danger of any potential play with legends beforehand. Facing a world of enemies, only fools could dream of getting away unchallenged with outrageous fairy tales; and according to the reports (especially those of the Acts), the first Jesus proclaimers were supposedly not such fools and dumbheads and fraudsters.

The monstrous difficulties for primevally christian legend formation are also emphasised by the following considerations. Let us just take the in the real life of those first

Christians totally unlikely case, the Christ believers had yet unfortunately decided to invent legends about their master, and to put them into the world, then there should have been an agreement reached over such undertaking among them. At least the "twelve" should have obliged themselves by handshake and oath, to never tell the opposing environment one little word about their legend fabrication. Quite besides the fact, that on the first public proclamation, they would probably have been laughed at – are we to assume, that the primeval apostles have really been such sly conspirators? And that they would have gone to their death for their machinations? Even the theologist critics now shout: oh no, such accusation is going too far, those men were by no means fraudsters. But especially according to the opinion of the evangelical researchers, there was yet fictionalising going on indeed! *Jülicher* has previously even told us, that we "cannot at all imagine too early a beginning of" the formation of legends! Who then has actually fictionalised? Perhaps any old fantasy-talented *miscellaneous* members of the primeval community? Perhaps as a poetic sport, in a manner of speaking? In this case, that much is certain, the "twelve", as the responsible leaders, would have put a stop to such close followers' handiwork, because they could not have possibly tolerated, that the "real" Jesus tradition, as their best means of advertisement, would have been devalued by somebody incompetent. (After all, according to the Acts, the primeval apostles exercised strict control over the communities formed outside of Jerusalem as well!) Thus, the evangelical critics are getting themselves into a bad fix here; since they are at their wit's end, they simply place the blame for the ominous Jesus fiction on an anonymous entity: the infamous "community legend"! The evangelical theologist *Maurenbrecher* does not at all mind claiming: "*The community itself has not perceived the difference between legends and real memories.*"⁸¹ [Oh, sure. This is how things *really* work – in lala-land.] *Maurenbrecher's* argumentation is admirable, namely: if the community had perceived the difference, they would of course not have consciously fictionalised; since it has

been established however, that fictionalising did occur, then such fictionalising must have proceeded subconsciously, naively, in the "community"! We thus stand again, as earlier with *Strauss*, before the strange spectre "community legend", this entity that seizes souls like a vampire, and fictionalises "within them". And these poor people do not at all notice, that "somebody" fictionalises in their heads!

Apparently a little more sensibly, the so-called religion historians, and subsequently, the form historians, seek to explain the proposed event. According to their view, the legend-pregnant environment, the miracle-addicted atmosphere of those days, had a "history-generating" effect [just like after WWII]. Involuntarily and necessarily, or habitually, respectively, circulating miracle stories were "transferred" onto Jesus! *"The occurrence, that already existing miracle stories as well as other anecdotes are transferred to a hero (a saviour or a God as well), can often be observed in the literature and religion history"* – or so *Bultmann* patronises us in this fashion, and presents as an example *"only Ovid Metam. VI.313ff, where the motif of the transformation of the farmers into frogs has been transferred to Latona."*⁸² The naivety of this completely and utterly unfitting comparison with the "realities" of the Jesus tradition is amazing. In the anecdote tales of Jewish rabbis, *Bultmann* further believes having found a voucher for his transferral theory, and for the christian communities, an "impulse" towards similar Jesus fiction. In this, *Bultmann* and the other researchers are overlooking the gigantic difference between any old Gods, heroes or rabbis on the one hand, and the "historical" Jesus figure on the other. Again, the already multiple times emphasised mix-up of the "historical" Jesus tradition and common folklore proves to be fatal. When certain sects transferred fairy tale motives onto their fantasy God, or when the Pharisees invented all sorts of educational anecdotes of dead rabbis, nobody got worked up over such "everyday" things. *After all, any old rabbi rotting in his grave was not meant to be perhaps declared "saviour of the world", either!* Which was the case with Jesus, however –

as always assuming that Jesus had even lived! Yet, the primeval apostles allegedly stepped before the hostile crowd with the monstrous claim, that the crucified and resurrected Jesus of Nazareth has been decreed saviour of mankind by Jahve! And they swore by all that is holy to them, that everything they reported of this human being Jesus is founded on facts, that it is historical truth. "Of this, we all are witnesses!" – so sounded their assurance. And the opponents had of course also been "witnesses" of all those Jesus deeds (the miracles included), since the things were not happening in a corner. It is thus suggested by the sources themselves, against *Maurenbrecher*, that the disciples must have very well perceived the difference between real memory and legend. If needed, the opponents in real life would have certainly made sure, that this difference would have been perceived. There is still something to be said against religion historians: especially since so much was invented in religious affairs anyhow, Jesus' followers, who could naturally only advertise with "real" Jesus history, had to cautiously beware of even the slightest attempt of attributing all-known, everywhere circulating fairy tales to their "elevated saviour". The disciples simply did not step before the people with a fantasy religion, but with a "historical" religion.

What is left over is to assess some particular results of the form historians, inasmuch as they involve the problem of the decomposition of the "real" Jesus tradition.

The occurred glorification of Jesus via invented or transferred legend material does also not become one bit more conceivable now by distinguishing *two groups* of stories, or types of stories, respectively. These groups allegedly betray a *development* (formation of layers) of the tradition. According to *M Dibelius*, the tales of the older layer are "*generally shorter, less decorated, stricter, they do not colour in, they do not say anything that is not necessary*". The younger layer can supposedly be recognised by the fact, that the tales of this group describe Jesus' deeds in a coarse folkloristic fashion "*with all sorts of accessories*".⁸³

Regarding the complex of tales called "*Apophthegmata*" (to which miracle tales belong as well) by *Bultmann*, we still hear from him: "*Since certain location details (as well as details of names and miscellaneous more accurate circumstantial details, by the way) do visibly not match the style of the apophthegma, it is a priori the verdict suggested that all those details have additionally grown secondarily.*"⁸⁴ [ugh!] So, *Bultmann* and *Dibelius* believe having found something remarkable with the new-testamentarian tradition. Namely, the Jesus tradition has supposedly at first experienced a tight, meagre period, but subsequently a fat period of growth. This view is shared by *O Pereis* as well: "*The short, catchy, on dialogue focused composition of the miracles will stand at the beginning. Of the vivid elements of the more extensively composed miracle tales, a good portion is attributed to the influence of the Hellenistic world, and cannot be viewed as genuine.*"⁸⁵ Since the allegedly at first writing evangelist Mark has already in the sixties found quite coloured-in, coarsely folkloristic tales (second layer), the period of the first, tight form of the tradition must have probably reached into the fourties-fifties. So, up into these years, with all narrators of the "real" Jesus stories, subconsciously or by agreement, the going fashion was to report only very briefly, plainly and strictly factually. The narration was so monstrously "factual", that it was practically frowned at to give details of names and places. Just do not name any names in the real Jesus stories! – so the apostles and the various other narrators conjured each other, because we still are in the "tight" period of course. Everybody understood this, too, and therefore, all reports of this layer are "brief, plain and strictly factual".

M Dibelius has racked his brains as to how the remarkable lack of circumstance of this first tradition period could be rendered conceivable, and in doing so, has had his epiphany: in the beginning stood the sermon! Why, he thus believes being able to explain the characteristic literary form of these uneventful pieces from primevally christian sermon practice, but has to be told by *Fascher* already, that he is moving in circles with his discourse:

*"Namely, Dibelius is not succeeding in rendering the origin of the in the gospels presented literary form of the "short story" conceivable from the sermon practice..."*⁸⁶ So, why the first narrators (the preachers included) were narrating so parsimoniously, so that details of neither names nor persons were given – that remains a deep secret. Time and again surprised, we simply ask ourselves, whether concrete details of names and places in the "real" Jesus tales do not perhaps carry a "factual" character then, and why? After all, 'factual' primarily means: historically true. Could there have even been any better means of advertisement and conviction for the first Jesus proclaimers, than "real" miracle healings most strongly testified to by naming the names of the healed ones and the localities? And what peculiar circumstances would have placed a general imperative on the first "preachers", to only talk stingily and uneventfully when they interspersed "real" Jesus stories as educating or edifying examples? The poor faithfuls by the feet of the preachers and first proclaimers of Jesus' message were sincerely pitiable. How would they have enjoyed hearing something more detailed and concrete of Jesus' wonderful deeds in the first period as well; but according to *Dibelius*, they must have been firmly reprimanded by the preachers to not develop quite so sweet a tooth with regards to biographical delicatessen! They should be patient for a decade or two, then it was intended to lift the restriction for names and miscellaneous circumstantial details. We can vividly imagine how those Christians must have been relieved, when finally, the uneventful terrible time was over, and now in general, it was permitted to narrate coarsely folkloristically and extensively, and – oh wonder! – even with details of names and localities!

Dibelius has allegedly yet again discovered the root cause of the turnaround. Namely now, he reckons, in primeval Christianity, the parsimonious preachers were joined by all sorts of narrators (folklore narrators) who had been attracted to the scene by the faithfuls' urgent desire for news on the deeds of the redeemer, as concrete as possible. It was a joy listening to these narrators. Because now, they were offering to the faithfuls the long missed details of the

names and localities in the Jesus reports. So, the "narrators" had previously inquired with the still living witnesses for the more detailed circumstances of the events from Jesus' life? In no way! Why should those narrators have killed their time by making inquiries? Was it not far more convenient to decorate Jesus stories – previously circulating in the community without concrete details – with names and localities *taken from the imagination*? Form historians indeed represent this peculiar opinion. So, with these christian folklore narrators, we should have finally found the authors of the legends!

Thus far, we have patiently followed the religion and form historians on their path of error. It is now time however, that we turn around. He who seeks "layers" in the new testament, especially the gospels, will find them – by creating them for himself. Indeed, the form historians assume a (paper-made) fact: that two types of Jesus stories can be distinguished in the gospels, namely the ones tightly told and the others extensively discussed. However, if they now arrange those two types temporally, i.e. they intend to demonstrate by them a development and layer formation, then this procedure is suggested by nothing, and it is pure arbitrariness. *Fascher* has also recognised this, when he answers his question: has *Dibelius* made the formation of the different "types" conceivable from the factors of primevally christian life? with "no". *"Only on complete stories..., he [Dibelius; K.] has... proven stylistic peculiarities, from those, concluded the traditionalising^{XL} by narrators, but those peculiarities of style do not give us an answer as to how the fabric, the entire form history has been created."*⁸⁷ The form-historical researchers have thus by no means succeeded in finding the much sought "residence in real life" for the formation of the types. *Bultmann* is for once so open-hearted to give a confession which makes a fatal verdict for the form-historical research (and for all relativistic history research per se). He says: *"However, essential is the realisation, that the form-historical work, principally no different to all*

XL traditionalise = to render traditional

*[relativistic; K.] historical work, represents a circle. From the form of the literary tradition, the motifs of community life shall be deduced, and out of the community life, the forms shall be made understandable. There is no method to adjust the necessary change and the mutual relationship of the two views, or to even prescribe from exactly where the first point of reference is to be made."*⁸⁸

Here, the declaration of bankruptcy of all *relativistic* history critique is spoken out honestly! At the same time however, the necessity and significance of my *absolute* method has been involuntarily placed in the brightest spotlight. After all, there is a method that once and for all brings an end to the eternal changes of relativistic types of view: *the absolute method, which finds its point of reference outside of the paper-made tradition in the living experience.*

In our case, the observation of the oral tradition of Jesus in the light of "real" life of primeval Christianity has established, that besides other factors, even solely the existence of the with the "real" tradition familiar opponents would have prevented the first Christians from getting the idea of wickedly devaluing their best means of proof and advertisement (simply the "real" tradition) by the contamination with customary fiction legend. The form-historical research is dying from a fatal mix-up: the evangelical tradition (yet again assuming their natural formation), standing under the force of "historical" factors, can simply not be ranked equal with any old common religious folklore. However, the form historians are not quite without merit, albeit that merit being of a purely negative nature. In the real life of the first Christians, the transformation of the "historical" Jesus tradition into folklore would have been impossible; if now the Jesus memories, fixed in writing in the gospels, nonetheless betray a striking resemblance with characteristic folklore – having established this is the negative merit of the form historians – then this precarious sign is new evidence for the fact,

that the new-testamentarian tradition as a whole could *not have possibly formed in a natural manner in the primevally christian space*. With this statement, the triumph of all "positive" (especially catholic) theologians is immediately dampened; that is, the triumph of those who want to draw the conclusion, that thus the entire Jesus tradition including all miracle stories represents *completely genuine* historical ware, by the sentence: in real life, the primeval Christians could not, and would have been permitted to, invent legends around Jesus. This conclusion is quite misplaced. We must simply once again very thoroughly contemplate the statement: in real life, the primeval Christians could not have invented Jesus legends. We must recognise that all of the momentum of this statement rests on the premise: *in the real life of the primeval Christians!* Now, what has been impossible in real life for the "first" Christians (namely, to invent Jesus legends), that has been very well possible and could have been easily carried out *many centuries later over the course of a big, learned action*. It is then also equally simple to invent the entire tradition of Jesus and his disciples including their opponents, i.e. the *primevally christian history as a whole*. Not only the poetic noble rust, but the entire "core" of the evangelical and primevally christian history can easily be invented by a powerful society of clever men (priestly fictionists and philosophers) in the form of a historical series of novels.

IV. The epidemic memory weakness of the primeval Christians

In this chapter, by further examination of the oral Jesus tradition, new evidence material shall be procured to support the claim, that the new-testamentarian tradition cannot have grown on a natural ground of reality, but has been generated artificially. As always, we again assume

now, that Jesus and his disciples had really lived, and that at least in its core, the tradition of his deeds and words has naturally grown in the primevally christian environment familiar to us. Under the assumption of the authenticity, it has already previously been clarified, how the peculiarity of the by the apostles proclaimed new religion, namely its "historicity", gave daily cause to keep the "real" memory of the master alive. Sermon, catechism, propaganda speeches, and more than anything, the unavoidable debates with the opponents forced the disciples ever again anew to utilise the "historical" facts of Jesus' life as means of edification and proof. By the force of real life would thus have best been taken care of Jesus' memory. In such state of affairs, something important from the master's Earthly life could not have been at all forgotten in the primeval community. All in any way meaningful life events, from the times before the public appearance of the Nazarene as well, must at any rate have been discussed on some occasion or another. By inquiring with the many still living witnesses of the spectacular events, all important details, such as especially the names of persons and places, could easily be established. For the first Christians, the "real" history of their passed-away and resurrected master was of enormous significance as a means of conviction. Many may have been talked into a mystery God of primevally old times; but nobody accepts an executed human being of the present time as their heavenly redeemer, if the latter cannot be authorised as such by facts, i.e. historical proof. Thus, from the first day of the proclamation of the saviour, everything was pushing for recalling the history of the human being Jesus to the world's memory, elevated to God's right-hand side, primarily of course, the significant events from the times of his public appearance. If the disciples wanted to notify *other* people of attractive reports on the history of their master, then it was required, that *they themselves* became most accurately familiar with all life events, which should not have been a difficult task for them, since of course still thousands of witnesses of the events were alive, and they themselves had been immediate, daily participants in Jesus' power deeds.

However, once the memory of Jesus' Earthly life with the main dates and main events had been updated and become alive, a spiritual possession and precious treasure would thus have formed for the primeval Christians, which could no longer evade them, and was not permitted to be lost. Because all circumstances that had caused the coming-to-life of the Jesus memories, remained effective with the same force in the subsequent period, in the sense of *preserving the memories of the life*, to strengthen them, and to thus render them never-to-be-lost property of the primeval christian faithfuls. Not only in the *first* year of the new faith, but also in the second, the third and the tenth, and in all the following years and decades, there was always in equal measure the desire to keep the memory of Jesus' deeds and words alive. The more the memory was consolidating over the course of the years, the less it was possible *to forget something important* again. I am deliberately emphasising: something important. In all fairness, with the first Christians, I am making allowances for human forgetfulness which over time erases the all too incidental and particularly insipid things from the memory. Therefore, when I am concerned with the quality of the primeval Christians' memory, I will only highlight real *main points* in the following discourse. And at this point, I will even still neglect the details of the main facts; I will focus on merely the naked fact as such.

Our general question in this chapter shall be this: *which significant portions of the "real" Jesus tradition did the primeval Christians have to by all means keep in their memories as historical means of proof?* Or: in the real life of the first Christians, could this or that significant event of Jesus' life *vanish completely from the memory within a frighteningly short time span*, or could it be so veiled, that no human could establish what was "right" any longer? We can only correctly assess the significance of this question by contemplating what short time spans we are dealing with there. Jesus has supposedly been crucified around the year 30. The scholars are in no agreement over when exactly the evangelists supposedly

authored their writings. (However, the reader already knows, that the books of the NT can only have been written after the tenth century.) If we want to summarize the researchers' opinions by averages, then Mark's gospel has formed in the 60s; the gospels of Matthew and Luke would have to be placed in the 80s to the 90s; and John would have written his gospel presumably in the years 110 to 120. Counted onwards from Christ's death, after which the proclamation of the new religion by the disciples set in almost immediately, have thus passed until the writing-down of the individual gospels: around 30 years with Mark, around 50 to 60 years with Matthew and Luke, around 80 to 90 years with John.

We are now able to formulate our question a little more accurately still: in the real life of the primeval Christians, would it have been possible, within a timespan of 90, or only 60, or even only 30 years, that *all main details and main events* from Jesus' life could be "forgotten", or had become so uncertain, that certainty over what was "right" could no longer be established? If we now take into consideration, that an equally strongly perpetuated desire of the christian community would have ensured the very best of care and consolidation of the Jesus tradition, then there cannot be any doubt that our *question* must be *answered in the negative*. In real life, the forgetting or even uncertainty over all main details of Jesus' real life amongst the circle of his followers, especially within a timespan of not even a hundred years, would have been absolutely impossible.

We can now barely contain ourselves from amazement, when we have to for example hear from the theologist *W Haupt*, what research so far has brought to light regarding the highlighted problem here. "*Besides the shining future image [that the primeval Christians have painted themselves with Christ's reappearance; K.] ... the pictures of the wandering life of the historical Jesus have paled. So it came, that already a short time after Jesus' death, the memories were sparse, much had entirely vanished from memory, much had become unclear*

and uncertain."⁸⁹ By no means do I want to deny, that the first Christians have also thought much about the shining future; but besides that, why should they have viewed the shining past with so much disregard? No reason at all existed for such disrespect; on the contrary, as we know, more than one weighty factor of real life made sure, that the Jesus tradition as strongly convincing means of proof was continually *kept* alive. I am furthermore happy to concede because the first Christians were of course only humans with a normal memory as well that many trifles of Jesus' Earth life could have gradually been forgotten. However, note well, that in the following, I will discuss no trifles, but especially the main details and main events.

First however, I would like to list a few examples that surprise us, because they show, how "faithfully" the first Christians could preserve in their memory even *quite insipid things and names*. Not only in 15,21, the evangelist Mark reports the name of the man who was forced to carry Jesus' cross, but he also knows, that this Simon of Cyrene was the father of Alexander and Rufus. He has also heard, that the name of the blind man of Jericho was Bartimäus. Especially Luke names many names of quite irrelevant significance; Symon and Manna; the Pharisee Simon, in whose house Jesus once ate; Joanna, Chuza's wife; the small publican Zachäus. The evangelist John reports "from the community legend" for example, that a certain person was sick for exactly 38 years. John also names from Jesus' life people of such minute significance as Malchus and Maria, Klopas' wife. He still knows quite accurately, that Jesus, before he went to the dead Lazarus, remained in the place and waited "*two more days*". Furthermore, according to John, it was around the sixth hour, when Jesus met the [female] Samaritan who has had five men already. So, according to this, how uncommonly faithfully and accurately has primeval Christianity preserved even quite inconsequential details in memory!

We now turn towards the *main facts* of Jesus' "history" however, and we set out to follow their fates in the sphere of memory of the "first" Christians. In doing so, our investigation aims at examining the quality of primeval Christians' memory.

Assuming that Jesus had lived, then without any doubt, at least the following main points would have to be, and remain, unforgettable in the memory stock of primeval Christians even after a timespan of 30, 60 or 100 years.

1. *Where did Jesus' parents live, and where has Jesus been born?*

In brief, the paper-made fact of the matter to be extracted from the gospels is this: "*That Jesus has been born under the government of the Elder Herod, is certain* [according to the new-testamentarian details!; K.]; *alone, whether this was at the end of the period of reign (Lk. 3,23: "approximately 30 years old"), or more in the middle of it (Job. 8,57: "not yet 50 years old"), we cannot tell. It can equally not be decided with certainty where Jesus has been born.*"⁹⁰ Already, this first sample of the memory quality of Christianity's decades is disappointing. So, just about 50 years after the master's death, in the circle of his followers, it was no longer "exactly" known when and where Jesus was born! Now, I will apply some leeway, and I will not even particularly insist on an exact time of birth, i.e. I will accept the potential objection, that the date has simply never been known from the start, and that it could no longer be established subsequently, either. (As you can see, I demand no special, let alone supernormal performance of the memory powers of those people.) However, the mentioned objection simply seems ridiculous in the face of the question, whether during the first time after Jesus' passing, it would still have been possible to find out just which had been the *birth place* of the Messiah and the *residence of his parents*? After all, the apostles could have effortlessly been told the truth even by Jesus' mother who, after the crucifixion, allegedly lived in the Jerusalem christian community. In real life, the disciples would have naturally

shown an interest in finding out the master's birthplace as early as during his lifetime. Once the Christians knew the place however, then it could not have possibly been forgotten again among their circle. Nonetheless, as the diagnosis of the sources shows, around 30 years after Jesus' death, it has indeed been forgotten in primeval Christianity just which was his home town. Namely, the evangelist then makes consistently mention of the "home town" without ever mentioning its name. "*It is indeed remarkable, that the evangelist avoids the name Nazareth*" – *E Wendling* reckons.⁹¹ That Mark "means" Nazareth can be concluded from the context of his tale. Then however, when Matthew one or two decades later wrote his gospel, the community tradition had reported to him something quite different, namely: Jesus' parents lived in *Bethlehem*, where Jesus was born as well. According to this tradition, there are quite particular reasons that caused the parents to subsequently abandon their actual residence, and to settle in the Galilaean Nazareth. Now, in stark contradiction to this report of Bethlehem as the original residence stands the tradition with Luke. He has been told, that *Nazareth* was Jesus' home town, and again, only particular circumstances (namely the "estimate") had resulted in the parents having to temporarily move to Bethlehem, where the birth has taken place. Now, especially the first evangelist Mark reports nothing of Bethlehem, silently regarding Nazareth as home town however.

Nonetheless, do not at least Matthew and Luke correspondingly report, that Jesus has seen the first light of the world in Bethlehem? Certainly, they both name Bethlehem as birthplace, but we have to be clear here, that there are *two streams of tradition* visible here which flow against each other, and thus cancel each other out. If Matthew is right, then Luke is invariably wrong and vice versa. If Jesus' parents were at home in Bethlehem, they did not first have to travel there, caused by particular circumstances. And had they only stayed temporarily in Bethlehem, then – to the contrary of Matthew's knowledge – this town was not their permanent residence. In this alternating current of the tradition, even the twofold

testimony for Bethlehem as Jesus' birthplace cannot provide the required steady support. Namely, this support is immediately destroyed by the oscillation of all closer circumstances. In the face of this talking-against-each-other of the evangelists, the "original" residence and thus birthplace remain uncertain. In other words: as soon as after around 50 years, the Christians – who of course previously must have "once" known exactly – could no longer tell with certainty, just where the messiah was "actually" born. In real life, such muddy memory, or its failure, respectively, would have been flat impossible. The following contemplation shows, how uncannily soon the memory of all Christians must have failed: if nothing certain was known after 50 years, then nothing accurate was known after 40 years; because had the birthplace still been known after 40 years, then the veil of forgetfulness could not possibly have of all of a sudden spread across it in 10 more years. If the place had no longer been known as early as after 40 years, then it could (for the same reason) no longer have been known as early as after 30, 20, 10 years, either, i.e. the birthplace has never even been "exactly" known. In real life, such thing would of course be impossible, because this is a fact that could have been inquired without any difficulty by Jesus' disciples during his lifetime, and would have been inquired, too. Had the Jesus tradition grown "naturally", then such important fact as the name of the messiah's place of birth and home would have been all-known and unforgettable amongst followers and opponents alike.

We thus come to the usual relative-critical "solution" of the riddle according to which "indeed" Nazareth (and not Bethlehem) was supposedly Jesus' birthplace. Since according to the prophet Micha (5,1), the Jewish messiah was meant to be born in Bethlehem as David's son – or so certain critics argue – *"so it simply went without saying for all Christians from the start, that the external attributes foreseen for the messiah had been fulfilled in Jesus."*⁹² The primeval Christians were *"sufficiently free of inhibitions, in order to help out history a little bit here as well"*, and they thus fictionalised, that Jesus had been born in Bethlehem, although

in reality, he had come into the world in Nazareth! Such legend "solution" can only be accepted by a historian-of-religion, since they, as is well-known, principally neglect to assess the paper-made things in the light of real life. I assume that it is probably no longer necessary here to discuss at length and width, that, and why, the first Christians would not have devalued or destroyed their "real" Jesus story as indispensable means of proof. After all, since the real birthplace has been *publically known* from the start, any geographic fictionalising would have immediately been recognised and eliminated as a lie *by the opponents*.

2. Has Jesus begun his public work in Nazareth or in Capernaum?

From the community tradition, the way it makes an appearance with Mark, we learn that Jesus has begun his public occupation in Capernaum. The "historian" among the evangelists, namely Luke, who himself explicitly emphasises in the preface to his writing, that he had carried out inquiries, knows differently however. Namely, he reports that Jesus' home town *Nazareth* has been the venue for the first appearance in public. "*Luke seems to take this for granted*", *K L Schmidt* reckons, i.e. he takes it as natural: namely that the messiah would have to be for the first time in his home town. According to *Schmidt's* view, Luke has *deliberately and arbitrarily* changed the "real" succession presented by Mark, in order to highlight "*a certain development from the small to the big*". "*Only after Nazareth can Capernaum be considered, and the land of Galilaea. In this way, Jesus' work draws ever wider circles.*"⁹³ *Schmidt* has observed quite rightly here. Only, he takes off-hand for granted, that the in other places in Luke's gospel appearing arbitrary re-grouping of the "real" events is the work of a *primevally christian* author. To him as a relativist, the thought does not even enter his mind to pose himself the question, whether a primevally christian author could have dared such high-handed development sport with the "historical" fabric of the all-known Jesus tradition? We must pose this question however – and answer it with: no. Because when Luke allegedly

wrote, the memory regarding the main facts of Jesus' life was so consolidated, that a member of the community would have been careful not to shuffle the individual facts of the tradition like playing cards, and to have the cheek to assure in the preface of his gospel, that he had reported everything "in the exact consecutive order" on the basis of inquiries! However, since Luke "indeed" got away with his gospel yet, and has by no means aroused any offence amongst his fellow faithfuls, we must thus – always assuming that the gospel had really been authored by a primeval Christian – trust the preface according to which Luke with *his* order of events is also supported by a community tradition. Again, regarding *one fact*, there are *two streams of the tradition* visible.

However, even the by Luke captivated tradition could not have been arbitrarily invented by any old primevally christian community member now (not by the evangelist himself, either). *This* tradition, too, would have to be supported by "real", or at least pseudo-real memory, and could be traced back as such to the earliest times (!) of the christian community. This would mean, that from the beginning, two mutually contradicting traditions would have existed on that point, or to put it more drastically: from the beginning, the primeval Christians have *never* been able to "exactly" *remember*, or to "*accurately establish*", whether Jesus had begun his public work in Capernaum or in Nazareth. Such failure of memory *during the very earliest times* is impossible in real life. If in Palestine "during Christ's time", any old simple man had lived and died without ever drawing any attention to himself or his environment; if furthermore, this man had rotted in the grave for 50 years, without any human being caring for the quite unimportant life details of this forgotten dead, because for that, there was simply no cause at all – then it would of course have been very difficult, or probably even impossible to establish anything certain on particular life details five decades after the death of that man. In such a case then, two or multiple different traditions could easily come to light, because with the best of intentions, they could simply no

longer exactly remember the relevant (and irrelevant!) events. Assuming that Jesus had lived, then in the primeval christian case, things lay essentially different, uncommonly *more favourable*. Jesus' life has not unfolded in silence, but has passionately aroused the Jewish land by all sorts of powerful utterances. And almost immediately after the messiah's death, his disciples stood before the people and were forced (in order to present ironclad proof for their claims) to inform themselves right accurately on the master's Earth life. Regarding the period of Jesus' public work, the disciples as immediate witnesses were in the very best position. In real life, there could thus never have been the slightest uncertainty over Jesus' first appearance.

3. *When and where have the first disciples been called upon by Jesus?*

On this point as well, the evangelists offer two streams of tradition, running against each other. The tradition differs regarding the time as well as the place of the calling. According to the Mark tradition, the calling of the first disciples took place *after* the arrest of the baptist, according to the tradition of the evangelist John, *before* however. As for the location, Mark reports of Lake Genezareth, John has the scene play out in the Peraic Bethany. Also, the two traditions differ in naming the involved persons as well. Mark names as the first called upon the pairs of brothers Peter and Andrew, Jacob and John. The tradition in John's gospel "remembers" it differently: the first to be called upon was somebody not named next to Andrew, only afterwards Peter, Philippus and finally Nathanael (a disciple by the way, who does not appear in the three older gospels). Two traditions could barely contradict each other any more strongly on one and the same thing. Only if the christian communities had *a priori* no interest at all in memorising times, places and names of the first called disciples, it could have happened that after a hundred years, no accurate news could be found anymore during research. From the first day of the proclamation onwards however, the required interest did

exist. And to top it off, the relevant tradition of Marks' gospel – which has supposedly been created as early as around the year 60 as the first gospel of course – "proves" that in this regard, memory had "indeed" vividly and faithfully preserved the real circumstances, after all. Because Mark – in the real life of primeval Christianity – would of course not have plucked a Jesus story from thin air, but he would have written down *that* which had been held up as "real" tradition in the christian communities back then, around 30 years after Christ's death. According to the opinion of the critics-of-relative however, this gospel of Mark with its presentation of the redeemer's "real" life history (in the period of his public working) had already been publically available for around 50 years, and was well-known to all Christians, when John has authored his work! Now, since this alleged John cannot be considered so boundlessly naive or cheeky to have simply turned the in Mark's gospel written down "real" tradition on its head in many places, the only remaining way out is that regarding the disciples' calling, John, too, has written down "real" tradition. And this tradition of John, too, would have to represent a stream of the tradition that had surfaced within Christianity next to the other (the Mark stream) *from the very beginning*. So, as early as in the first years after Jesus' death, the nearest ones involved, the disciples, would thus have no longer been able to "accurately" establish, i.e. they had completely forgotten, *where* they had been called upon to follow the master, and *whom* he had prompted first. In real life, such forgetfulness is impossible. It follows that not only the presented contradiction in the individual case, but the entire Jesus tradition must represent an artificially generated phenomenon.

4. *The duration of Jesus' public workings*

If the primevally christian tradition were one to have naturally formed and grown in real life, then it would go without saying, that the first Christians would have known, and would also have never forgotten, *for how long* the messiah had publically worked and taught since his

first appearance. On this point as well, the "paper-made" fact of the matter in the gospels makes sure of the apprehended surprise. We note that it has *never* been known *exactly* in the primevally christian community, whether Jesus taught publically for only around one year, or perhaps two to three years. Viewed in the light of real life, this "fact of the matter" is so hair-raising, that ideally, we do not want to waste any serious thought over it. If I nonetheless subject the presented discrepancy in the tradition to a discourse here as well, then I do this primarily in order to show to the reader the fruits of relativistic pseudo-critique by one glorious example. He who does not quite believe it yet, that all relativistic historical critique is merely a sport disguised as science – here they can yet again convince themselves of it.

In this precarious question, the new-testamentarian reporters behave so, that the first three evangelists (Mark, Matthew, Luke, the so-called synoptists), with their corresponding description of a *one-year* working, sharply contrast their colleague, the evangelist John, who *assumes a duration of the workings of two to three years*.

However, only one of them can be right of course! So shout the relativists, and have their results crush into each other. Even catholic scholars storm against each other with a critical verve – we could feel bright joy over their explicit expressiveness, if we did not know, that the question of the duration of Jesus' public workings has silently been declared dogmatically irrelevant by the church, and that thus, the surprising critical openness on this harmless point is for once quite exceptionally tolerated. When for the university year 1904-1905, the catholic faculty to München had raised as the prize question the subject: "The duration of Jesus' public workings", three works were entered. From the mass of the contradiction-filled sources, the first editor (*Fendt*, 1906) has distilled the result: Jesus' appearance took only *one* year. From the same source material, the second (*Zellinger*, 1907) has gained the result: Jesus' working in public had continued for *two* years. And behold, the

same sources have told the third man (*Homanner*, 1908) upon his "critical" efforts: Jesus' working lasted *three* years! Then which one is "right" now? Yet, only *one* statement can be right of course, our relativists shout in desperation, and ever anew, they initiate their see-saw-method. (It has not even occurred to them, that *no* detail at all is historical.) In the year 1917, as a result of a repeated scrutinisation of the sources – with the relative method, of course – *V Martl* proclaims, that for the theory of the one-year duration, "*not one single valid argument of a positive nature is available*", thus, according to his theory, a multiple-year working must be assumed to be historical.⁹⁴ In 1919 however, *H J Gladder* again declares just the one-year duration "*historical*".⁹⁵

Assuming that John's gospel had really (next to the three first evangelists) been written by a Christian of primeval clerical times: then it could of course not have been a joke by the author, had he thrown important portions of the already decades long consolidated "real" tradition of the synoptists overboard, and presented to Christianity a different time-space progression of Jesus' life. Against such arbitrariness stand the same reasons that I have presented in the previous example. At best, such radical modification of the "real" tradition would have only been possible with the consent of the vast majority of Christians of that "later" epoch. (We just quite disregard the opponents here, and also the fact, that no clerical-dogmatic-cultish cause existed at all for the ground-breaking overturn of the temporal and geographical facts!) If we assume such conspiracy against the "truth" of the Jesus story however, we have to also grant the fraudsters enough insight to properly perform a wholesome job. Part of that was primarily to erase the existing "real" tradition, i.e. to either destroy the troublesome synoptical writings, or at least re-work them in line with the "new" tradition. That has not happened however! And just because the "real" tradition remained untouched, the John tradition can neither be the result of personal arbitrariness, nor that of a general primevally christian conspiracy. Even on the point of the duration of Jesus' workings,

the primevally christian author of the fourth gospel must thus, in real life, have rested on a "tradition" that had existed and multiplied within the community from the beginning. With this, we would again be facing two mutually contradicting streams of tradition, a "fact" only conceivable on the premise, that from the beginning of their proclamation onwards, Christians were unable to agree on the "real" duration, because they had simply "immediately" forgotten this important fact. That such forgetfulness is psychologically flat impossible, is plain to see.

At this point, it appears useful to have a brief review. Is it not very conspicuous, that our critique has delivered proof ever anew, how the oral tradition of Jesus' life regularly splits into two streams of tradition, which sharply contradict each other right into the very core? Have then the medieval forgers, who according to our perception, formed a planfully working association of equal-minded men, *not previously agreed* what, in terms of "historical" details, names, places etc. should feature in the christian novel series? Why did the collective work so sloppily, thus making itself so vulnerable to the critical co- and after-world?

The reader may be assured: the forgers have by no means worked sloppily; they have set to work with the sharpest mind. They have also *agreed* as to how the "facts" of the christian primeval history should be dealt with – and yet, again and again this discrepancy in the reports? With some contemplation, the solution to this apparently so difficult riddle can be found fairly easily.

During the conception of their Jesus story, the forgers of the Middle ages stood under a fiction *imperative* they could not escape. They necessarily *had to* let their history run along in two mutually contradicting streams; they had no other choice. May the reader simply put themselves into the forgers' boots by raising – as those men – the following consideration:

Where should we have Jesus to have been born? Immediately, the forgers found themselves under an imperative, because considering the honour of messiah that Jesus was meant to receive, it was utterly unavoidable to have him come to the world in David's town Bethlehem, according to old-testamentarian prophecy. However, Bethlehem was situated only just under 6 miles away from Jerusalem – and this fact has caused the forgers a great headache as well as the greatest embarrassment. We can easily empathise; just consider: namely, had Jesus carried on living in his home town Bethlehem as a child, a youngster and a man, then his work as messiah had to begin here as well, or nearby, respectively. (And we of course learn from John's gospel, too, that the first disciples have been recruited in the further away situated Peraic Bethany!) This means however: Jesus would have begun his "criminal" workings immediately under the eyes of the opponents. Directly here however, the forgery association was faced with the cliff of the (Judaic) stream of tradition, if it were to be kept flowing in this fiction. After all, what would have happened in the rough reality of those times? A man, speaking so rebellious, as Jesus in the role of messiah had to do, would invariably have been arrested and executed after only a few months. Such a short duration of Jesus' public activity was of no use to the forgers at any rate, as we will momentarily show. Since the forgers were clever, they soon saw how to evade the cliff: on the one hand, the messiah could be permitted to be born in Bethlehem, but on the other, he had to begin his public work as far away as possible from Jerusalem, and thus, the solution was forcing itself: the master and his disciples had to be home in Galilaea. This again resulted in contradictions which were unavoidable however, and which had to be principally accepted.^{XLI}

XLI Now that he's shown us uncountable times, that the deliberate contradiction is *the* prime tactic of those forgers, Kammeier still accepts that they were forced by historical necessities? This one could have been solved by having Jesus' parents move away from Bethlehem at any time after Jesus' birth, for example. Any such contradiction will keep humans at everlasting unease over every stinking detail of this garbage, and only *that* is the whole point of *this* particular contradiction as well.

Now, regarding the problem of the *duration* of Jesus' public workings, the following points had to be considered:

Let us just assume, that the forgers had agreed on a one-year working period; after some contemplation, the following concerns are raised: Jesus' occupation was meant to take place in Galilaea as well as in Judaea, but especially in Jerusalem. Now, the messiah was not permitted to merely be on the way from Nazareth to Jerusalem like a preaching wanderer; because his profession as messiah should, and had to consist of announcing in all (at any rate, in many) towns of Galilaea and Judaea the impending empire of God, and to legitimate his divine mission by miracle deeds everywhere in the land. For that, time was required (even in the fiction!), especially since initially, not only "the whole of Galilaea", but occasionally even Pagan land as well as the semi-Jewish Samaria had to be visited. Primarily however, "all of Judaea" had to be admonished to penance together with Jerusalem. How could they (without slipping into ridiculousness) have the messiah lament at the end of his career, that despite all his efforts of conviction, the "Jewish people" have rejected the offered salvation, if he had not really troubled himself over the soul of his people in hard – i.e. longer work! Short and sweet: if we, as writers, merely moderately contemplate this novel, then it follows (and it followed for the medieval collective, too), that Jesus could hardly be expected, even on paper, to complete his missionary work, should it be carried out seriously, in "the whole of Galilaea and Judaea" within the span of one year. If the forgers wanted to preserve the facade of real life, then, facing the planned scope of the missionary work, they had to spread Jesus' public appearance over multiple years.

The reader thinks: yet in that case, they could have just simply agreed on a *two- or three-year* activity. Against this however, a concern of the weightiest kind is towering up, on which the forgers have also been quite clear, as is still well apparent from the sources. Even a

brief look into the gospels teaches us, that Jesus' penance sermon did not sound shyly and gently behind closed doors, but in broadest public very often distilled itself into the heftiest accusations against the God-stubborn Jewish people and its leaders. In particular, the messiah's public reproaches were almost daily aimed at the external legality of the religious practice of his compatriots, who rewarded him with ever increasing hostility as a result. Now, in real life of those times, such a revolutionary religion-prophet could not have been made to storm against an existing, sanctified system with the boldest deeds and words (temple cleansing! Sabbath violation!) for years, without the so heftily attacked authority (the Jewish synedrion) calling to account and render this violator of the existing order harmless. If they (namely the forgery association) had this religion revolutionary proceed so open-heartedly and fearlessly in this purpose novel, the way they had simply planned him to be, then as little as *one* year of rebellion would have been a plenty long allowance for the patience of the synedrion. In no case were they permitted to let Jesus in such over-zeal irritate the authority for over a year without effecting this daring one to stop. For the forgers, as a convenient way out of this dilemma, the result was the popular use of the *tactics of the deliberate contradiction*: so, they simply had the "synoptists" hint at a one-year working of the messiah – only vaguely hint, by no means clearly speak it out! – and in the fourth gospel, they have implied, only quietly implied as well, that Jesus had worked publically for multiple years, although it is by no means stated with certainty, just how many years could be considered. So, the forgers have thus not committed themselves, but thoroughly weighing the facts, they have left the question of the duration of Jesus' working forever in suspense by the use of the tactics of the deliberate contradiction. However, our pitiable relativists now always have to rack their brains in vain over this tough dilemma, and amongst it all, they do not even have the first idea which circumstance is to blame for this strange calamity.

5. *After the resurrection, where has Jesus appeared to the disciples?*

Here, we are dealing with the questions of the *locality* of certain events, that is, of epochal *main events* which had to be inextinguishably ingrained in everybody involved. On the one hand, *K L Schmidt* is not wrong, when he reckons: "*That the localisation of a certain scene (in the memory) disappears, has nothing wondrous about it*"⁹⁶; but on the other, he should not have neglected emphasising that such forgetting of localities only applies to the small, insipid everyday ongoing. Because the big, powerful, attention-rousing events, and those that internally overwhelm the ones involved, will ingrain themselves so deeply into the memory regarding the locality as well, that the localisation cannot disappear again, at least not over the course of one short age of man, and more than anything of course, not if the involved persons have to ongoingly present the relevant event in sermons and debates as a means of proof. Even theologians such as *Dalman* point out, "*that it appeared to be important to know the location of certain events in Jesus' life. The gospels with their location details served... equally as reassurance of the believers and as defence against the disbelief.*"⁹⁷ Very true; assuming that the Jesus tradition had formed *naturally*. Now, in primeval Christianity, there was barely an event to which the apostles had to "testify" as frequently as the "visions" of the resurrected. If something had to be kept alive in the communities, it had to be primarily the "fact" of those visions, so that in real life, it would have been absolutely impossible to forget the exact locality on this point. However, if we now inform ourselves in the gospels on the paper-made fact of the visions regarding their geographical determination, we are placed before a downright monstrous diagnosis. We have to experience, that the epidemic memory weakness takes on fantastic proportions in this affair. It has taken the breath of even some relativistic researchers. *Maurenbrecher* is "amazed" over "*how uncannily quickly the memory of the first generation in the legend has gone under... With uncanny speed, the legend has defeated history.*"⁹⁸

So far, we have been able to examine the tradition, fixed in writing, in its recognisable earliest stage with Mark, the allegedly earliest writing evangelist. Regarding the "visions", we are now in the fortunate position, in an address of the apostle Paul, to possess a tradition testimonial one decade younger still. In the first Corinthian letter 15,3-8, Paul reports^{XLII}:

"Because I have brought to you that which I have also received: that Christ... has died... and that he has been resurrected... and that he has appeared to Kephaz (Peter), then to the twelve. After that, he has appeared to more than five hundred brothers at once, most of whom have remained until now, but so many have passed on as well. After that, he has appeared to Jacob, then to all of the apostles..." Paul solemnly protests here, that his knowledge of the "visions" is founded upon the most certain information. Striking is, that he does not say anything about the location at which Jesus had shown himself to the mentioned ones. Are we to explain his silence by the assumption, that the apostles and brothers could no longer forward anything accurate on the localities? Then the ones involved must have "forgotten" the location as early as around 20 years after the sensational events, an assumption which refutes itself. And yet, even the "first" written gospel of Mark arouses the same concerns especially in this regard: from Mark, we do not find out anything at all about Jesus' apparitions, *since the "original" ending of his writing has allegedly been lost*. In the "un-original" ending of the Mark handwriting, there is talk of visions on the one hand, which on the other, is not corresponding with Paul's list however. So, when Mark wrote, certain knowledge on things "really" appears to have no longer existed. Matthew writes later; and what does he report as a result of his inquiries? He could name only *one* occurrence: only Jesus' apparition before his disciples on an unnamed mountain in *Galilaea*. As a result of the well-known memory weakness, the tradition has obviously experienced further muddying. We now curiously inquire with the evangelist Luke, who has of course carried out particularly careful investigations, according to his own reassurance. Who will still wonder to

XLII Since my KJ 's first Corinthian ends with number 13, I am winging this...

hear that the tradition has told him something different again? So, according to him, the visions have taken place only *in Judaea* (in and around Jerusalem)! Namely according to Luke, the disciples have not fled to Galilaea, but remained in Jerusalem. If they had consistently remained in Jerusalem however, then Jesus could not show himself to them on that mountain in Galilaea. With regards to the location, an abyss is thus gaping in the tradition between Matthew and Luke. By the way, what Luke has to announce in terms of details of the apparitions in Jerusalem, does in no way correspond with Paul's details. The third evangelist has then a little later still written the Acts as a continuation of his gospel. Now, in the meantime unfortunately, the muddification of the community memory had worryingly carried on progressing. While namely Luke narrates in the gospel, the apparitions in Jerusalem had all taken place on one day (resurrection Monday), and that Jesus had still on the same day ascended into heaven in Bethany, he relates in the beginning of the Acts, that Jesus had been seen by the disciples "during forty days", before he parted from them at mount Olivet and ascended towards heaven.

Let us just assume against better knowledge, the Jesus tradition had naturally formed in the real life of primeval Christianity – how shall we then explain these crass contradictions in the apparition details? All considerations then leave only the one conclusion: that the primevally christian communities, i.e. the involved ones themselves (the disciples), from the first moment of the "experienced" visions onwards, could not exactly remember. In real life however, such degree of forgetfulness of epochal events is impossible. Even theological critics have perceived this, and by the following explanation, they are seeking to help themselves over the most essential offence, the glaring contradiction regarding the locality of the visions: *correct* is the tradition of Mark and Matthew, according to which the disciples have supposedly left Jerusalem and fled to Galilaea after Jesus' execution, and have there experienced the visions. Later however, the Christians could no longer bear the fact of the

disciples' humiliating flight, and have deemed a beautification of the accusatory affair necessary, so that, when Luke was writing, they began "fairy-taling" that the disciples had by no means fled after the crucifixion, but had bravely remained gathered in Jerusalem. In line with such correction of "history", it would of course have also been necessary to "relocate" the apparitions from Galilaea to Judaea! – This weakly explanation attempt does not testify to a deep insight. When Mark wrote, no Christian would dream of taking offence with the disciples' flight to Galilaea. Even several decades later, when Matthew authored his gospel, he could mention this fact free of worry, because again, nobody took offence. One or two decades after Mark however, when Matthew^{XLIII} began his writing, all of a sudden now, a turnaround has supposedly occurred: now, the Christians have allegedly perceived the flight as embarrassing, and have offhand corrected history. It can quite easily be proven however, that the Christians have in no way taken offence with the "real" tradition of the disciples' escape: *how else could they have left the embarrassing large as life description in Matthew's gospel standing!* Facing the opponents' lurking mistrust, if the Christians had even dared correct such an all-known "event" as Christ's apparitions, then they should have at least performed a wholesale cover-up job. The fact alone, that Matthew's description has remained entirely untouched, is already devastating for the assumption of an arbitrary correction of the tradition. Thus, regarding the locality of the apparitions, the Jerusalem tradition *cannot have been additionally fictionalised at any old time subsequently*, it must have much rather existed *next to* the Galilaea tradition from the beginning. Such discrepancy in the tradition would mean, that already at the beginning of their Jesus proclamation, i.e. just under a year after the events, the involved people would have had "forgotten" a downright essential detail, namely the locality, or would at least have no longer been able to quite accurately remember. Since such

XLIII In order for this entire passage to make any sense at all, 'Matthew' should most likely read 'Luke'. It is quite beyond me, how such a mix-up could occur in the first place, but 'Matthew' in this particular place/sentence, simply does not add up, as we will momentarily see. One way or another, something is wonky with the names and decades here.

a degree of forgetfulness is impossible, this case of bipolarity of the Jesus tradition, too, can only represent an artificially generated problem.

To discuss examples of the epidemic memory weakness of the primeval Christians still further, is well superfluous. We are now already entitled to summarise the examinations of this chapter in the following result: certain paper-made facts in the gospels show a discrepancy in the tradition, which could only be explained by an occurring memory blur with the first Christians. However, since *both* streams of the tradition must have existed *from the beginning* – because none could have been subsequently added arbitrarily! – it would have to be concluded, that the memory blur had occurred *almost immediately* after the mentioned sensational events. If we now consider, that the here established uncannily quickly occurring weakening of the memory must have raged epidemically amongst the involved people, and that furthermore, especially the very most important facts of Jesus' life would have been affected – then, on the basis of an appeal to the living experience, we are forced to the conclusion: *memory weakness to the described degree is impossible*. The surfacing psychological absurdity is further complicated by the fact, that just the same people who always "forgot" the essentials of the main events so quickly, were on the other hand quite capable of remembering quite irrelevant events in all detail. In real life, human beings with such mishmash psychology do not exist, they never have existed, and they never will exist. Thus, the described primeval Christians are no real humans of flesh and blood, but schemes, fantasy beings, i.e. totally invented figures. "Primeval Christians" have never existed; consequently, no "natural" tradition could have formed and grown amongst fictional beings, either. The entire primeval christian tradition thus reveals itself to be an artificial product of a planfully working forgery association.

V. Religious-psychologically, was the alleged formation of a primevally christian church even possible?

What has already been made most probable by our previous discussion of the problems of the *handwritten tradition of the new testament* (in the first part), has now, as the result of all previous investigations of the last chapters, become a full certainty: the Jesus tradition cannot possibly be the result of natural formation and natural growth. At this point of our critical advance already, it is established that the apostles and the alleged primeval Christians per se represent fantasy figures in an invented series of novels. Without the disciples as proclaimers of the Christ belief and founders of the first christian community however, the person Jesus also vanishes from real life, and necessarily moves into the sphere of fiction together with the apostles.

If the disciples and primeval apostles are, as their master Jesus, invented schemes, then it goes without saying that they cannot have founded a christian community and church in real life, either. The Acts that report such founding as a historical event, must therefore in truth represent an apostle novel. To conceive and fairly vividly produce novels, even those of historical or pseudo-historical content, is an easy art for authors gifted with imagination and open for reality. However, the beautiful art of fiction becomes difficult, very difficult, every time it is required to detail the drafted pseudo-historical novel so vividly and real not only regarding the external events, but also in its psychological foundation, that the entire invented story not only appears likely in the small and the big, but exactly as true and real as life itself. The reader may therefore a priori guess, that the new-testamentarian apostle novel, in its *psychological motivations*, will show the same *impossibilities* peculiar to all of history fictionalisation. The following examination of the so-called Acts will confirm this guess in its full extent.

I am not the first critic who has recognised the Acts as a novel. Since *C F Baur* and his Tübingen School, i.e. since around a century ago, this Luke script as "history" of the formation and first dissemination of the christian church has the worst conceivable reputation. Especially the first half of the work, which is concerned with the *fate of the mother community to Jerusalem* and the work of the primeval apostles, in particular that of Peter, has often been dismissed in a sharp tone as outright fiction. *Schwegler* thus reckons: "*If not all signs deceive, then the first part of the Acts is an ongoing fiction.*"⁹⁹ *Gfrörer* equally banishes the chapters 1-12 to the realm of legend history.¹⁰⁰ Although in most recent times, the theologists have strongly slowed down the ever more worryingly into the negative rushing train of their critique, *Jülicher-Fascher* admits: "*The full view of the eyewitnesses (may) partially... take(s) effect, closely next to it however, we meet... the fog-like and often quite counter-historical ideas of someone born later. The identification to which the apostolian age is being subjected here, is not of the kind that could be performed by even an enthusiastic and uncritical contemporary: for that, it is much too schematic... Each reader will likely view the numerous speeches that "Luke" puts into his heroes' mouths as a free invention of the author.*"¹⁰¹

It now also becomes clear from the last quoted sentences however, that on the one hand, all these critics more or less consider, wholly or partially, vast portions of the Acts to be purposefully dressed up, but that on the other, they all still assume a historical core of primeval Christianity under and behind the fiction cover yet. Real history, or so sounds their thesis, has been, out of ignorance or deliberation, more or less strongly fictionally re-cast and newly designed by the author calling himself Luke. May for example even the *speeches* be invented – or so say these researchers – the *persons* are and remain real and historical. The first truly radical and consequent critique, also regarding the second part of the Acts, stems from the year 1850, and has been delivered by the most brilliant critic of his century on this

topic, by *Bruno Bauer*. It is surprising, how this researcher, still strongly caught in the relativistic methods, has managed to reveal the "poetic machinery" of the entire Luke script. "*Mechanically, as the machine is set in motion, it has equally been put together by its author*" – with these fitting words, he characterises the "nature" of the Acts.¹⁰² However, that even *Bauer* still establishes a certain primevally christian reality behind the fiction facade – no Jesus as founder of the primeval community however – already follows from his temporal placement of the Acts' origin. In the second half of the third century, a "compiler" has supposedly already found the alleged Luke script, and has enriched it by all sorts of additions. This is a grave error however; from the discussion of the problem of time in the first part, we know that, and why, *Bauer* – as by the way *A Drews* and the other modern critics do as well – find themselves on the wrong path of critique with such early origin of the evangelical scripts. The previous investigations on the "preservation" of the new-testamentarian scripts have already opened the reader's eyes to the fact, that this literature must in truth have been created much later than in the second century.

I now begin the new critical attack. In doing so, I need no longer emphasise that not the rusty weapons from great-grandfather's times, i.e. not the relative pseudo-method, but the weapons of the psychological ("absolute") method will enter action. I will penetrate through the external walls of the described events down to the *psychological foundation* of the entire primevally christian building. So, my absolute critique principally proceeds in the sphere of the *primevally christian psychology*; and as we will momentarily see, this is primarily an intense scrutinisation of the alleged behaviour of the Christ-followers' *opponents*.

Our new attack is based upon a strategic plan of examination, finding expression in the following general question: psychologically, *was the alleged foundation of a primevally*

christian community and church even possible in the Jewish environment assumed by the new-testamentarian sources?

The absolute critique will now penetrate the territory of the primeval christian "history" in *two points of attack*.

First point of attack: *How come, that the disciples were not arrested together with Jesus, when he was arrested?* So far, critique has moved over this question with seven-mile-boots [= ignored it], which changes nothing about the fact however, that it is one of the very most important and momentous questions in the entire NT. It is necessary to begin with a brief review of the evangelists' reports on Jesus' arrest. It is of course clear as day, that the possibility to "found" a church, or the impossibility, respectively, depended on the fate of the disciples on the occasion of the final catastrophe of their master. Had the eleven (the traitor Judas was of course dismissed) been arrested, sentenced and executed together with Jesus, then they could not have founded a community of Christians. For the best part, the report on Jesus' arrest corresponds among the synoptists. Mark reports, how under the leadership of the traitor, a big, armed multitude of the people has moved out in order to catch Jesus (*not the disciples as well!*). According to Mark, the multitude had been sent out by the high priests, the scribes and the eldest. Luke has even learned during his inquiries, that the high priests and the eldest had joined the crowd in person! On this "tradition", *J Weiß* reckons, that it factually reports improbabilities, "*because the noble hierarchs would not have given themselves to performing catchpole duties.*"¹⁰³ According to *B Weiß*, the "multitude" consisted partly of regular troops, partly of the temple watch.¹⁰⁴ At the time of the arrest, Jesus has been in Gethsemane with the disciples. Since the "multitude" did not know Jesus, Judas, by agreement, points out the wanted one by a kiss, upon which the catchpoles arrest him. "*One of the bystanders*" now draws the sword and cuts off the ear of the high priest's servant.

"Then they all [disciples; K.] abandoned him [Jesus; K.] and fled." Since the fate of the disciples shall concern us, we focus our entire attention on the last sentence. So, why have the disciples not been arrested as well? The answer of the evangelist Mark (and Matthew) is: because they have fled! This so innocent looking sentence is a psychological pitfall, which the authors of the gospels *had to* dig themselves! Let us just view the described event in the light of real life, and then, let us ask ourselves: *why* actually did the disciples flee? Of course, they were probably seeking to get away *for fear*! Then what did Jesus' disciples have to fear? Their own arrest, naturally! And why should they have been led away, arrested as well? Here, we could say: because they have just committed resistance against the authorities, by one of them hitting out with the sword. But if, as is explicitly emphasised, only one committed resistance, and else, there was no cause at all for their arrest, then it was on the one hand quite understandable, that the overzealous one took off, but then, on the other hand, there was no good reason for the peacefully behaving remaining present ones to also take to fleeing, and to make themselves "suspicious" by doing so. Once again: if they else felt without guilt, they could follow without any worry a potential prompt of their leader to temporarily accompany him, since they could easily prove their peacefulness and innocence. Only, as mentioned, *else*, there must not have been any cause for fear or escape! Thus, if despite this, all (!) disciples fled, then there had to be a *different* strong reason driving them to doing it. Then such reason existed? Indeed; and it was given by the fatal circumstance of the *apostleship*. As is well-known, as faithful apostles, the eleven had committed the same legal offences (violation of Sabbath and cleansing regulations) as the master. When the catastrophe was approaching now, the eleven had to at least fear the same fate that was threatening the master. Since all apostles have "indeed" fled, as the evangelist relates, simply only one circumstance could have been crucial for it: that a priori, they had good cause to assume, that they, as Jesus' apostles, who had gone through thick and thin with the revolutionary master, were also

threatened with arrest and sentence. Only for this reason could all of them, without exception, have sought their welfare in fleeing. If they were really threatened with disaster from this direction – their escape proves it – then Jesus' company must have already *previously* made sure, that the synedrion, or the Pharisees and scribes, respectively, viewed *their* [the apostles'] comings and goings with queer eyes *as well*. We thus come to the view of the events seen from the opposing side. A decision on the fate of the apostles must also have been made in the high council previously. In the best case, this decision could decree to also arrest the company of the alleged messiah, in order to reprimand them not to talk of the Nazarene as the messiah in future. They did of course not perhaps want to kill only Jesus as a human being as such, but to eradicate the by him represented idea. However, since this idea lived on his apostles even after the annihilation of the individual person Jesus, the Jewish synedrion had to also consider the fate of the eleven, and then necessarily arrive at the realisation, the the hated messiah movement of the Nazarene could only be eliminated, if the apostles would also be rendered harmless together with the master. First of all, it would have to be attempted to force the eleven to permanent silence by unbloody means. At any rate, the high council, had it not consisted of complete dumbheads, would have come to the decision to have Jesus' company *arrested* as well.

In this moment, it becomes clear to us, that the author of the Mark gospel entangles himself in a ball of psychological impossibilities, when he writes down this so harmless looking sentence: all apostles fled. This little sentence gives away, that the alleged primeval Christian Mark (as well as Matthew) [and the rest of them, let's not forget!] is a writer, that is, a writer who has yet again hit the wall with his psychology. The quintessence of the ominous sentence namely lay in the by the evangelist silently, yet with great self-evidence reported "fact", that all apostles have succeeded in their flight, too. Stunned, we ask ourselves: should it really have been possible for all of Jesus' company to escape unhindered under the

described circumstances? We have good cause to be sceptical, and for that reason, we want to view the situation a little more accurately in the light of rough reality. Firstly: since in the synedrion, a decision must have been taken on the fate of the apostles as well, which even in the best case, entailed arrest with subsequent reprimand; since therefore, preparations for the arrest of the apostles must also have been planned – therefore, by real life, the entire action would have been scripted essentially differently to what is described in the gospels. Since throughout Judaea, the place where the wanted ones were present was known, the synedrion, in real life, would have had the entire district surrounded, and thus would have had no trouble with arresting all. Or they would have simply taken otherwise useful precautionary measures in order to guarantee getting their hands on Jesus' company as well. *"The narration of Jesus' arrest and the flight of the apostles assumes that precautionary measures were necessary; use of armed forces, choosing night time and deception"*¹⁰⁵ – theologian E Klostermann reckons as well. Only a fiction writer will want to convince us, that all apostles gathered around Jesus could really have fled, too. We want to object, the apostles could have fled, because the catchpoles did not make any serious effort to pin them down as well. However, this assumption is being refuted by the evangelists themselves; because Mark suggests that the catchpoles really had a tight grip. A "certain" youngster, i.e. an unnamed follower of Jesus, on his attempted arrest, in dire need, dropped his garment and fled naked! So, it was serious with the arrest of all of Jesus' company after all! But strangely: all apostles fled! All apostles were able to flee unhindered. Thus reports to us the evangelist with a perfectly straight face – I wanted to say: the with their psychology crashed inventors of the evangelists. But in their situation, these inventors have done what could be done. The literary task with which they were commissioned demanded, that the apostles by all means had to be kept out of the catastrophe of their master – *who else then should have founded the church*, had the apostles also been arrested and sentenced? In real life, Jesus' company, surrounded by a great

armed multitude, could not have fled, at any rate, not all apostles would have succeeded in escaping, even if they had dropped their garment as well. As a motif for the flight, we may assume whatever we want (just that the apostles had actually fled without any cause as well, and only, because they had lost their heads), the way the situation was – all of Jesus' company could not possibly have succeeded in fleeing. And whoever could perhaps by chance get away during the night yet, would of course in real life have been pursued by the catchpoles so long, until he would have been picked up in some hideout.

In this affair, I can present to the reader still further surprises, and at the same time, interesting proof for how uncommonly thoroughly the gospel inventors have contemplated the mentioned precarious problem of the apostles' flight. The fatal sentence: all apostles fled – only Mark and Matthew bring it. Luke indeed reports the progression of the scene very much correspondingly, *but with him, the offending sentence is missing!* This is the simplest solution to avoid the dangerous cliff. The curious reader of Luke's gospel can now contemplate for themselves, just what has then become of Jesus' company that night. What is more however, is that especially Luke could not possibly let the apostles flee from Jerusalem, because – as we already know from the discourse on the apparitions – he has of course learned from the "tradition", that Jesus had shown himself to his faithful followers after his resurrection in and around Jerusalem. (Therefore, Mark and Matthew ultimately also imply by 'flight' the unhindered return of Jesus' company to Galilaea.)

The evangelist John causes us the other surprise, i.e. the gospel authors in the mask of John do. Our writers were clear about not yet having eliminated the stone of contention, created by themselves in the Mark and Matthew gospels, by simply omitting the apostles' flight. The problem: how come, that the apostles have not also been arrested, and could "withdraw" unhindered? – had to be thoroughly contemplated anew. And behold, a fiction

"solution" was found. They had "John" bring a surprising explanation in his gospel. The apostles have not been arrested, because they, as completely harmless people, *were left to calmly go their way* – writes John (18,2 ff.) Here, Jesus explicitly asks the catchpoles: whom are you seeking? Answer of the police crowd: Jesus of Nazareth. I am he, said Jesus, and then stated with emphasis: if you *only* seek *me*, as you have declared yourselves, then *let these go their way*! And so it happened, John suggests; the apostles could stay there in peace, or go where they wanted unharmed. So, according to the evangelist John's opinion, to the catchpoles (and the Jewish authorities), the existence of the great revolutionary's apostles was a matter of complete indifference, although it is reported here, that Simon Peter had been the one who drew the sword and cut off the servant Malchus' right ear! However, nobody placed any value on arresting the apostles, and so, they did not have to flee at all, but they could comfortably withdraw.

Does John not offer a "brilliant" solution to the difficult problem? Really, everything would be so nicely in order, if firstly, John were not correcting himself in a later place (he namely reports in 20/19, that the apostles stayed hidden after the catastrophe, and that the doors were shut for fear from the Jews!), and if secondly, the well-known, ominous sentence were not standing in Mark and Matthew. However, Mark and Matthew reassure with certainty from the tradition, that the apostles fled. If the apostles fled however (if they had to flee in the first place), then only, because they were meant to be arrested. But if they were meant to be arrested, then they could simply not go their way "unchallenged". *One description cancels the other out!* Alas, the tactic of the deliberate contradiction is celebrating its triumphs even in this hidden place.

By this example of the apostles' flight, it can be seen, that even the best writers, despite all efforts of thought and imagination, do not succeed in describing an invented "fact"

life-like, if this fact as such is psychologically impossible. In the presented case, the design plan of the primevally christian drama demanded, that the apostles by all means had to escape the master's catastrophe unharmed – *so that later*, in line with the forgery association's plan, when their "world-historical" hour had come, *they could found the "church"*. Unfortunately however, this fiction task can by no means be mastered psychologically flawless and true to reality. Let us just assume for a moment, the gospel inventors had contented themselves with John's solution, then it would have to be rightly feared, that thoughtful readers would ask themselves: then how is it only possible, that the apostles, who had committed the same offences as Jesus, were offhand left to go their way? It is therefore insidious to commit oneself to one description, because then, unwanted but unavoidable questions are raised, which cannot and are not meant to be answered. Such thing does no harm in a novel, but very well in a script stepping up with the claim to be accepted as true to reality. In such a precarious situation, *the tactics of the deliberate contradiction* was worth gold to the forgers. The inconvenient questions of the one description can now be "answered" with a silent reference to the other kind of description, and vice versa. Naturally, a real answer is not even possible, and by all means not intended, either. To be pitied are only the poor relativistic critics, who desperately exert themselves to establish the "real" state of affairs from such conscious and deliberate contradictions. After all however, it is not for Christians to ponder the "facts" of the salvation history, but to believe them.

Now, which demand does result from our investigation regarding the initially raised question of the possibility of a primevally christian founding of a church? We started with the premise, that the possibility, or impossibility, respectively, of the foundation of a christian primeval community as seed of the church indubitably depended on the "real" fate of the apostles on the occasion of their master's catastrophe. The scrutinisation of the various reports in the gospels made us recognise, that one description cancels out the other. Both

reports are suffering from internal impossibility, and both collapse. Mark's and Matthew's description turns fragile by the fact, that in real life, it would have been impossible that all apostles were to first have succeeded in escaping, and subsequently, in permanently hiding from the authorities. John's report is made to crumble by the fact, that in real life, Jesus' trusted apostles, who have become jointly guilty by word and deed, would not have gotten away without arrest and interrogation. It is not even difficult now to imagine such interrogation in its results, if it had taken place under the in the gospels reported circumstances. Two options are given. Either the apostles have unreservedly stood by Jesus before the synedrion; then they would have been sentenced and executed like their master. Or the apostles have shown repentance and sworn off; then, in the best case, their punishment would have meant castigation and temporary imprisonment. In the very most favourable case, they would have been dismissed with a harsh warning and the strict injunction to never again represent and disseminate the hated views of the executed Nazarene. One does not kill the leader in order to calmly tolerate subsequently, how his followers carry on making propaganda for the idea that was to be eradicated [in the first place]. In real life, the Jewish authorities would not have neglected taking suitable measures to silence Jesus' apostles as well. It is thus certain then, that with the first violation of the silence injunction, with the first attempt at a renewed propaganda, the apostles would have been immediately arrested, and this time, would have hardly gotten away alive. This however, means nothing other than: *the foundation of a primevally christian church by the apostles or other Jesus followers would not have been possible at all under the described circumstances and presuppositions.*

The investigations of the following chapter will emphasise the impossibility to a still much stronger degree.

VI. The central problem of the christian primeval history

The central problem is the question of the publicity of the primevally christian faith propaganda.

I know very well, that faithful humans who had sworn off their faith, have nonetheless subsequently, under the impression of a disturbing experience, stepped before the public as proclaimers of their ideal. By temporarily taking the news of the Acts for valid historical currency, I also theoretically set the case in the life of the apostles, that after a certain while after their successful escape, they have also gone through such disturbing experiences. So, for tactical reasons, we want to "forget" for a moment the results of the previous chapter, and faithfully assume, all apostles had really succeeded in escaping the catastrophe by fleeing. Momentarily, the theologists are at hand, shouting: yessir! After their master's execution, the apostles, as is "established" (!) by the sources, have had certain experiences that were of such strong effect on the soul, that they had no choice but to now proclaim to the entire Jewish people the rocksolid conviction of Jesus' messiahdom. Which experiences are referred to here? The reader already knows them: they are the to the apostles gifted "visions" of the resurrected one.

As experts know, the "critical" evangelical theology has declared a surprisingly large part of the new-testamentarian tradition unhistorical (has declared it to be community legend) – before the "fact" of the to the disciples gifted *visions* however, even the most liberal theologists has prudently halted. Namely, without the "fact" of the visions, the theologist loses all "historical" ground under their feet; because the apostles of course, in the face of the catastrophe, "famously" saw their hopes collapse, fled and abandoned their master, and therefore, all theologists urgently need the visions, in order to make it psychologically conceivable, how it then came, that the discouraged apostles suddenly picked themselves up,

and became fearless prophets of the crucified one. So, the theologians establish from the sources that a powerful experience, just these visions of the resurrected one, has turned the desperate apostles into proclaimers again. We can now immediately cause any theologian some bad embarrassment, if they were to tell us straight and clear – not perhaps, how the "nature" of these visions can be explained: whether as objective apparitions of Jesus, or as subjective visions of the ones involved, but – *where* the christophanies have "really" taken place, whether in Jerusalem, or in Galilee? However, the reader knows from the investigations from the 3rd and 4th chapter, that, and why, it is impermissible to have the first Christians *invent* Jesus stories in real life. Therefore, catholic critics seek to overcome the painful contradiction Jerusalem-Galilee by proclaiming, that basically, there is no contradiction at all. All we have to do is interpret the sources correctly, then all reports will by themselves harmonically join to a uniform entity. How to manage this trick, I will show by the following heart-warming example. *K Adam* protests: *"If we... disregard the certainly striking difference, that Matthew tells only of one christophany, gifted to the apostles on a mountain in Galilee, while Luke merely reports of apparitions of the Lord in Jerusalem on the Easter day itself..., then, with all the rest of the discrepancies between the gospels, we are dealing with trifles, why, mostly irrelevant things."*¹⁰⁶ What a wonderful logic! Like so: besides the differences, everything is in harmony! Disregarding the strong cold, it is quite warm by the North pole! But as a theologian, one simply has to be principally able to "disregard": then, all concerns are erased, and all source mysteries solved with playful ease. Why, this is the relative monk's method's last triumph: *one* side is declared correct each time, by peacefully "disregarding" the *other* side.

For once, I also want to "disregard" now, namely that discourse of the christophany problem, and instead, simply assume as "given", that by visions of the resurrected one*, the apostles had really been so agitated internally, and become so rocksolidly convinced of Jesus'

messianity, that they took the momentous decision to *publically* proclaim the divine dignity of the ascended Lord without hesitation. In the Acts, which will preferentially concern us from now on, we can read in desirable copiousness details on the appearance of the apostles who were equally set alight by the apparitions. Out of the dark, they practically storm into the brightest light of *public*, and they thus arouse on paper our admiration to a high degree. At the same time however, our suspicion and alienation as well. Because these people seem to have absolutely forgotten, that they are confronting a world full of hostility, hatred and suspicion with their sensational new creed. Open-hearted, unafraid, filled with enthusiasm, they (predominantly their leader Peter) were preaching in streets and [public] places the new faith of Jesus as the elevated messiah. They were preaching before a people, who had only a few months, even weeks prior shouted "crucify!" over the Nazarene, that is: before *opponents and enemies*. And by having our mental eye look at the phalanx of these opponents, we notice a weighty problem surfacing.

* I can bypass the visions as such here, because a different point of attack will offer itself to us as more suitable.

On the one hand, this problem concerns the extraordinary and totally unexpected manner of the apostles' first appearance in broadest public, on the other hand, the mysterious behaviour of the opponents towards the renewed Jesus propaganda. And this problem is not one of the usual ones, one of the countless little miniature problems discussed by the new-testamentarian critics, but, as the reader will soon notice, this is the *central problem* of the entire Acts, and primevally christian history as such. Briefly formulated, the complex of problems is this: *was the by Luke in the Acts described behaviour of the apostles and their opponents possible in real life of those days?* With the answer to this question, the other question is also automatically dispatched: *whether the foundation of the primevally christian church was religious-psychologically possible?* Notorious misunderstanders will now

certainly remind me, that the christian church does indubitably exist, so it must of course have once been founded, too. Who would want to object to such imperative logic? I will be careful not to, but I will point out, that my question is aiming at: whether the indubitably existing church can really be attributed *the* origin that the new-testamentarian and otherwise "early christian" sources would like to lend it? Or whether its true origin is a different one, or when and how and by whom the church has in truth been founded, respectively?

G Weizsäcker has already realised, that in the workings of the apostles in broadest public as described in the Acts, a difficult problem has been raised. Since we must later thoroughly assess his solution of the problem, we want to have a closer look at his discourse. Weizsäcker writes: *"Still much more important than all concerns against the individual parts [of the Acts; K.] ... is the result of the examination of the perception that the author has of the overall situation. This perception simply does not limit itself to the fact, that in the very first beginning, a time of secrecy and peace existed for the community... His [Luke's; K.] description works with completely different, very strongly applied colours. In the most glaring light, it is described, that the apostles, from Whitsuntide onwards, publically raise their addresses before the whole town, that they equally set everything in motion by miracles and the view of their miracle deeds, that even the innermost life of the community lay before everybody's eyes...Historically, such a starting period is impossible, unless one is to assume, that the sentencing and execution of Jesus by the public powers had occurred quite in opposition to the opinion of the masses... However, this is justified as little as it is in the intention of the author of the Acts, who much rather, and only now, has this entire movement begin. Had such movement even been conceivable, it would certainly have been swiftly suppressed. It would have made immediately impossible especially the toleration of Jesus' followers; it would have made it impossible for the authorities to spare the followers of the executed one, and to first wait, whether they would still endeavour anything further.*

*Especially for that reason however, the behaviour of the apostles themselves, in such downright challenging manner as well, is impossible."*¹⁰⁷

With this, *Weizsäcker* has characterised the general problem with admirable clarity and intensity. The "absolute" critic will acknowledge with satisfaction, how intensely *Weizsäcker* ignores the relative method, in order to instead measure the paper-made "facts" with the yardstick of living reality. And viewed in the light of real life, the verdict over the challenging public propaganda activity of the apostles cannot be anything but this: in the related Jewish environment and under the described circumstances, such provoking behaviour was simply impossible, or it would have become impossible after a very short timespan, respectively. In order to fully realise the correctness of this sentence, we now want to concretely and vividly imagine just exactly what had supposedly happened back then in Jerusalem, barely a year after Jesus' execution.

So, according to the information of the Acts, men stepped up in streets and [public] places of Jerusalem, and by rebellious and insulting speeches against the authorities, have given cause, that the entire town had to deal with them, whether they wanted to or not. For these daring public speakers and agitators, the circumstance alone was worrying, that they openly identified themselves as the apostles of the only very recently executed Nazarene. Naturally, of people who had cooperated with the sentenced blasphemer, it was viewed with cordial displeasure that they have yet again given rise to talk. (I ask the reader to not overlook that here, as already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, I assume, the disciples survived the catastrophe of the master quite unharmed and untouched, because they had "fled".) Especially the Jewish authorities had good cause to be annoyed over the sudden re-appearance of these men. And this all the more, after they had learned, what kind of speeches the apostles gave! Namely, they accused the holy synedion of judicial murder, committed against the executed, innocent Jesus of Nazareth. We rest here for a moment in order to

contemplate, what in such a case would without any doubt have happened in real life of the Jew people back then. The public prosecutors would have been arrested on the spot. Yet, we still have not mentioned those points in the speeches, which stirred the souls to a much increased degree. The Jesus apostles proclaimed quite monstrous things: an incomparable miracle had happened – the executed master had risen up again from death! He were alive again! To the synedriion, to the entire Jewish population, this frantic claim had to have the effect of a busted wasps' nest. However, those men had still further, still far more monstrous surprises to offer. They have solemnly and sacredly assured, the resurrected master has not perhaps remained on this Earth, but has been taken into heaven by Jahve himself! Jesus of Nazareth would now sit by "god's right-hand side". Then, the apostles have still dared proclaim to the faces of the listening Jew people, who were paralysed by surprise and shock, that Jesus does not perhaps sit quietly, picturesquely like a common angel by Jahve's side, but that the almighty had entrusted him with an office, the office of messiah, the redeemer! From now on, only those humans could be saved sinless and just, and from eternal damnation, who believe in the crucified, resurrected and elevated Jesus of Nazareth as the by Jahve instituted "saviour". Henceforth, there be no salvation in another's name in the whole world!

I once again ask: what would have likely happened in real life, if followers of an executed "criminal" had stepped before the people with such speeches only a few months after the catastrophe? The synedriion would not have patiently waited for twenty-four hours, but they would have had the rebels arrested, subjected to a painful interrogation, and most swiftly sentenced off. *Weizsäcker* is quite right: in life, such movement would have soon, very soon, been suppressed. The high council would have presented to these agitators a stately wreath of charges: disturbing the public peace, insulting the authorities, blasphemy. Even now, I leave it open, whether the ones sentenced would have been executed or

imprisoned for longer. This is certain however: the synedrion would have made sure to nip in the bud the by the Jesus' apostles unleashed movement by any means.

However, the theological critics now hurl at me a 'Halt!' Do not forget, they retort, the in the Acts mentioned special circumstances favouring the apostles and their faith movement. I have not at all forgotten or consciously overlooked the well-known circumstances however. I even welcome these allegedly the Christ movement favouring circumstances to be subjected to a quite thorough examination.

So, which *are the special causes and circumstances*, which, according to the Acts, were effective in preventing the primevally christian faith propaganda from immediately and ultimately coming to a standstill? They are the following: a) the by the apostles allegedly conducted evidence for Jesus' resurrection; b) the "fact" that the apostles and first Christians lived strictly according to the Jewish law; c) the "fact" that the opponents (members of the synedrion) had been disunited over the type of action against the new movement; d) the "fact" that the high council would not have dared take sharp and quick measures for fear of the people – who worshipped the apostles for their miracle healings.

I will now set out for a critical examination of these four points, which by the way demonstrate to the reader yet again, how sharply and thoroughly the inventors of the new-testamentarian literature have contemplated all surfacing questions of literary conception, in order to simulate at least the appearance of real historical life.

a) the by the apostles conducted evidence for the resurrection

During their interrogation by the synedrion, if perhaps the apostles could have succeeded in delivering exact proof for their claim, that Jesus had returned from death to life, then indeed, the entire situation would in one blow have gotten a totally different appearance. Nobody will

deny, that in real life, the Jewish high council would have demanded such proof from the ones arrested. We have to thus examine, whether the resurrection proof has been delivered by the apostles, or whether it could even have been delivered at all, respectively. Let us ask ourselves: which then was likely the most essential point in the complex of proof? And so, some contemplation swiftly leads to the realisation, that the *grave* would have to be found *empty*, if/after the there buried Jesus had risen up. In real life, also the ones involved, the apostles, would naturally have been quite clear on this prerequisite, so that before their public appearance, they would have convinced themselves of the fact of the empty grave by inspection. In the question of the grave, we find a deterring example of just how short of blood and reality-removed theological thinking in "historical" questions is with *J Weiss*, who has by the way relativistically established, that the apparitions (he considers them subjective visions) have not, as is predominantly assumed, taken place in Galilaea, but in and around Jerusalem. *Weiss* manages to relate "... that the oldest circle of apostles had not yet known anything of the empty grave, [i.e.] that this tradition has much rather surfaced only later... There was thus the belief in Jesus' resurrection, without considering the empty grave in this... in the first days, none of the apostles thought of (!) convincing themselves at the grave itself, that the Lord had risen up: the apparitions of the transfigured one were fully sufficient to justify their certainty."¹⁰⁸ Any commentary towards such naivety should be fully unnecessary.

So, in real life, the apostles would have protested during the interrogation: the grave is empty! Anybody in the synedrion can convince themselves with their own eyes. *T Zahn* (and also the catholic critics, because they want to prove the "factual" resurrection of Jesus with the empty grave as well) views things more lively than *J Weiss*. *Zahn* rightfully emphasises: "*Without this fact [of the empty grave; K.] being acknowledged, any sermon on Jesus would have been a hopeless endeavour in Jerusalem; because the easily produced evidence in the*

opposite case, i.e. that Jesus' body still lay in the grave, would have rendered the preachers silent forever."¹⁰⁹ So, the apostles could triumphantly shout: see for yourselves! The grave is empty! However, the big question now is, *whether the apostles, with the argument of the empty grave, could make an impression on their judges?* After all, in real life, the synedrion was no congregation of imbeciles, who, from the fact of an empty grave, *must offhand* have concluded the occurred resurrection of the body previously placed in it! So, even on a potential viewing of Jesus' empty grave, the members of the synedrion remained cool and sceptical, and frostily replied to the apostles: if a grave is empty later, then this can have quite different and very natural causes. And then, the judges could have said to the faces of the ones arrested – and according to Matthew 28,11 ff., the Jews have "indeed" done this – that they had quite simply stolen the body from the grave previously. In real life, from that moment on, the cause of the apostles would have been hopeless and lost. Amongst the circle of the judges however, i.e. amongst the *opponents*, they would have insisted on the most obvious and most natural explanation of the empty grave – the apostles themselves had secretly removed the body – and would have thus carried on, free of worries, treating the eleven as fraudsters for as long as it would have taken them to *prove* their innocence of grave robbery. In their situation however, such proof would have been quite hopeless. We must simply not disregard the a priori equally hostile and biased stance of the Jewish authorities towards the apostles and their hated Christ proclamation. The synedrion placed no value on faithfully believing the apostles' claims, but it placed all value on revealing their blasphemous speeches as lies. To remain suspicious to the extreme went quite without saying with such stance on the side of the synedrion and its members. We could even present the "testimony" of the evangelist Matthew as proof here. According to him namely, the high priests and eldest had known even before the apostles' public appearance, that Jesus' grave is empty. Matthew reports that on resurrection day already, the grave watch had come to the members of the

high council with the news: after an "earthquake", during which they had all fallen to the ground "like dead", the grave had been empty! [It's that 'style' again!] The authorities, Matthew carries on reporting, had then given the sentries enough money, and made them tell everywhere, that the apostles had removed the body during the earthquake. The evangelist notes explicitly: this talk has become notorious with the Jews up to this day. Regardless of how things were "really" standing with this alleged corruption affair, the "talk" of the Jews "up to this day" would sufficiently show, that the apostles would not have made any impression at all with their argument of the empty grave against their opponents, who were bent on their [the apostles'] annihilation. So, if no other proof, and no solid proof could be produced for Jesus' claimed resurrection, then the verdict had already been spoken over the daring rebels.

And behold, the apostles have "indeed" another capital resurrection proof to present. Jesus had really and truly risen from death, or so they asserted. If the high council would not want to accept the empty grave as proof, then they could testify to the fact, that their master was alive, by the fact that he had *appeared alive* to them from the third day after his death! If we now set the case, that the apostles, as liberal theology is assuming, had experienced visions of Jesus as inner ongoing, then it goes without saying, that again, the claim of such alleged "inner experiences" would have been lacking all impression and faith on the outraged members of the synedrion. No matter how much the arrested ones protested and swore the "factuality" of their visions: the sceptical opponents, whose only purpose was to suppress the Christ movement, would have cold-bloodedly advised them to swiftly do away with such fantasies and inventions. However, the apostles would have gotten the same to hear, had they declared, that these were in no way hallucinations or pathological states of mind, but that Jesus had really and truly, in his full corporeal-ity, appeared before them, in the external world. Back then, Jesus had really stood before them in external form, had talked with them,

and had also been touched by them with their own hands. After his resurrection, he had by no means been a spectre, because he had even been eating and drinking with them. The members of the synedriion would have initially listened calmly, then they would have asked curiously, where then the resurrected one would be now, at this very moment? They would then have received this answer: now, the resurrected one no longer remains on Earth, he has ascended to heaven, and now sits to Jahve's right-hand side as the redeemer. In real life, the judges, i.e. also always the opponents, would not only have shaken their heads mistrustingly over such claims. Before that, they would not have been put off of asking the apostles for the detailed circumstances of the "apparitions". So, the ones arrested would be questioned one by one, and they would have told just how, and predominantly *where*, the wonderful ongoing had taken place. What would have surfaced during this questioning? We already know it from the discourse of the fourth chapter. With their resurrection tales, the apostles would have entangled themselves in an ever growing ball of contradictory statements. Since they, one and all, suffered from the well-known, ghastly memory weakness, some of them reported one single apparition on the mountain in Galilaea (Matthew tradition); other disciples, on the other hand, swore: not in Galilaea, but in and around Jerusalem, the Lord had appeared to them (Luke tradition). Short and sweet, on the basis of this contradictory "testimony", the members of the synedriion would have been strengthened in their conviction of dealing with madmen or impertinent fraudsters. According to Mark 14,56, even the members of the high council already knew, that witness testimonials are true and of value only, if they essentially come out correspondingly. The fate of the prisoners would then have been decided along those lines.

However, the apostles would not have given up quite so easily, the theologists reckon, who are of course thoroughly versed in the Acts. We are reminded, that the apostles could still present the so-called "power proof in the name of Jesus". Certainly, they would have

offered such proof; only, the question is whether this kind of evidence procedure would have generated any more of an impression than the argumentation with the empty grave and the apparitions. Everything rested of course *on the impression on the opponents*. In addition, let us now cold-bloodedly assume that the disciples, as the Acts reports, had also been able to perform miracle healings. During their interrogation before the high council, they could then have explained: if you do not want to attribute any power of proof to the argument of the empty grave and the apparitions gifted to us, then we can present persons to you, who have been healed by us from serious long-term illnesses – by calling upon the name of Jesus! If we succeed in miracle deeds "in the name of Jesus", then this is obvious proof however, that our master, killed by you, *lives* again, i.e. he has indeed risen up from death, and upon our request, intervenes and *works* from Jahve's side! Yet again however, the arrested ones had to experience a bitter disappointment. Because even the presentation of healed ones "in the name of Jesus" did in no way leave the expected impression on the synedrion. At any rate, not in the sense that they had now been convinced of Jesus' resurrection – quite to the contrary. Even in the sense of the theologians, I can be "factual" here, and "historically" prove from the Acts, that in such a case, Peter has achieved nothing, but was harshly reprimanded to henceforth "*not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus*". (Acts 4,18) And how has Jesus himself fared "historically" then? Despite all the great miracle deeds, the synedrists have rejected him, and had him executed! Anyway, "wonder healings" were an everyday occurrence back then. The Pharisees were able to "ban ghosts", too. (Matthew 12,27) If I were a relativist, I could even reference Josephus ("*Altertümer*" VIII,2,5)^{XLIV}, who tells of Jewish demon exorcisms, where healing was effected by naming the name of Solomon. So, the synedrists could equally conduct counter-evidence against the disciples, that according to the logic popular with them, Solomon must have "risen up" and must have been "elevated" to messiah and redeemer by Jahve. So, the apostles with their power proof had thus all the less

XLIV Kill me if I know what kind of reference this is meant to be. Anyhow, 'Altertümer' = 'antiquities'.

of any luck. With this, they have exposed one more vulnerable point however, because now, they could have been additionally charged with demonism. *M Baumgarten* says on this point: *"The possibility of a demonic miracle (comp. Mt. 12,24) is already considered in the law on the prophet... Obviously, the synedrists are thinking of this basic law for the presented case [Baumgarten refers to the healing of a lame one by Peter; K.], and from just this, they want to tie a rope for the apostles... They knew of course, that the apostles had healed the lame one in the name of Jesus; so, they had put the name of Jesus in the place of the name of Jehova. This was now very easily interpretable as seduction to idolatry, since of course, as they reckoned, the distance of Jesus the crucified to Jehova the almighty in heaven is undeniable, and so, they had the proven sign of the false prophecy."*¹¹⁰

It therefore follows – even "historically" – that the accused apostles could have conducted the proof of the resurrection and ascension of their master at the very worst with their name-magic before the hostile members of the high council. If we now view the whole as well, then our verdict must be: in real life of Judaism back then, the accused would have hopelessly failed in all points of the resurrection proof. Thus, the staff would have been broken over the blasphemists, and their *Christ movement* would have been *choked from the start*. Also, there is no doubt that in real life, the embittered Jews would have caused the disciples the same fate as they had recently caused their master.

This is now also the place to concern myself with opposing arguments, which *J Weiss* has formulated as follows: *"The synedrion, who were of course not even permitted to perform executions, had to be very careful in the conduct of Heretic trials – the trial of Jesus of course shows, how difficult it was to make such charges plausible to the Governor. The Roman administration also saw it their duty to protect the population against any arbitrary raging of the authorities who appeared biased to them. It was not at all easy now to construct a charge against the Nazarenes. That they thought of a dead teacher as the messiah was no*

crime against the law."¹¹¹ With his objections, *Weiss* has yet again bad luck throughout. To stay with his last sentence: the apostles' claim, an executed human being had risen up and "ascended", and were now sitting to Jahve's right-hand side as redeemer and future judge of the world, was the very worst crime against the law that could have even been committed: it was the worst blasphemy that a pious Jew could imagine. Namely, the apostles have not only passed off their dead master as a messiah in the common Jewish sense (as worldly leader and King of the Jews). A charge was not even difficult, but quite easy to construct with such claims, even a long series of charges. However, the confirmation of the blood sentences and their execution was a matter for the Roman Governor – reckons *Weiss*. Good; there is not even any doubt now however, that the Roman authorities, too, would have viewed people who publically raise frantic – for being completely unprovable – speeches and claims of resurrection and heavenly elevation of an executed criminal as disturbers of the peace and dangerous fraudsters, and would have treated them accordingly. If such fools and stirrers of the people were to be rendered harmless by the Jewish synedrion, then even the Roman authorities would not have seen any "arbitrary raging" in such measures, but would have shown full appreciation. Ultimately, in real life, there would this time have been as little talk of a "discrepancy" between the Jewish people and the synedrion as over the sentencing of the master of the charged ones, because – the example of Stephanus even proves this "historically" – in the face of the blasphemous and in all points unprovable proclamation, the people and the high council would have been quite in harmony over the measures to be taken. (We will get to discuss this point more thoroughly still.) If *Weiss* reckons, the Jews had difficulties with the Roman Governor even over the confirmation of the verdict in Jesus' trial, then "historically", the exact opposite is the case: because although Jesus had allegedly been found not guilty by the Governor, he gave the order to the execution of the "innocent one" surprisingly lightly and swiftly! Yet, we want to just set the case, that this time – with the

sentencing of the charged apostles – the Governor had, for undefinable reasons, permanently resisted an execution: would then the synedrion no longer even have had the possibility to eliminate the blasphemists from the world? (By the way, the Acts themselves report, that in the synedrion, they were determined to kill the apostles, but allegedly prevented from doing so only by the Pharisee Gamaliel.) If the Governor was not obedient, then the high council could rightfully act on their own account, even without exposing themselves, if they proceeded fairly skilfully. Why, even Stephanus had thus simply been stoned by the people without judicial verdict. And later, so we learn from the Acts, forty Jews conspired: they "*did not want to eat nor drink, until they had killed Paul*"! So, if the Jews wanted the death of the apostles – and in real life, the blasphemists would hardly have been left alive – then they would have known how to carry out their plan, too.

b) The law-abidingness of the first Christians

We now want to discuss the other "circumstance and causes" that have allegedly prevented the disciples from losing their game forever with the first christian propaganda speeches. Here, the theologists point out several details of the Acts, which "indeed" show, how carefully and cleverly the first followership of the new Christian faith proceeded in Jerusalem. Namely, all Christians still remained "true" to their Jewish church, lived as pious Jews strictly by the the law now as before, and zealously went to the temple for praying. These people wanted to also be Christians however; therefore, next to the Jewish piety, they permitted themselves the specifically christian way of faith. So, after the temple service, the apostles, for the purpose of practising the christian cult, gathered in private houses with the community members to "break bread". Naturally, in these daily occurring private gatherings, the "ascended Lord" was the subject of all reverence, sermons and talks. These messages from the Acts startle us, who yet also know the messages from the gospels. What? The apostles and first Christians – strict Jews? We barely trust our ears. Do we not know then

from the gospels, *how freely Jesus himself, and with him, the disciples, confronted the law?* How for them, commands for eating, cleansing, Sabbath no longer played the old role? And barely a year after the master's home-going, the apostles should have "forgotten" all of that? As enthusiastic Christians, they should have become the most zealous law-Jews again? Unfortunately, it is so – the theologians remark, because it is written in the Acts; the faith to the law is explicitly emphasised multiple times here! Or should perhaps the public demonstration of the faith to the law have only been cleverly calculated tactics, so as to not become unpleasantly conspicuous, to disguise oneself? No, no! – or so we hear the theologians protest; the primeval Christians were certainly no hypocrites; only, "love to their nationhood [/folkdom]" drove them on to also strictly fulfil the demands of the law. However, we do not even need to rack our brains over such questions. To us, it can be a matter of indifference, for what reason the previously so free disciples all of a sudden were such law-abiding people together with their followers. For we now want to view these things in the light of real life of those times. So, one fine day in the capital [city], as we have heard only just now, the apostles stood before the surprised people with their resurrection and salvation message – and naturally (in real life), they were *immediately* arrested and soon sentenced. What does this mean? It means, that in real life, the disciples would not have even been left or given any time and opportunity to long-windedly prove their law-abidingness. It goes without saying by the way, that together with the apostles, already existing miscellaneous Christ followers would also have been instantly called to account and forced to silence. Nonetheless, I want to hypothetically set the case, that the apostles had been left to be for a little while, and even left to form a community. Could then these Christians' public adherence to the Jewish law have caused the synedion to tolerate the Christian movement for *that* reason? In real life, under no circumstances. They would have rightfully reproached the Christians: you only do this out of caution and calculation, not out of conviction of the

holiness of our laws. You are hypocrites and malingerers, who want to protect themselves from punishment by such tactics. Why, we know you! After all, we know exactly of your doings in the past! You may allegedly suffer from memory weakness, but fortunately, we don't. May now the apostles have become honest law-Jews again for love of their nationhood: their protestations would have been of no use to them, simply because their opponents would not have believed them. Still one question however: would then the in the Jewish sense frantic belief of the Christians in an executed criminal as the redeemer of the world have become in any way more tolerable to the synedron by simultaneous law-abidingness? Not a shred! Thus, even the circumstance of the emphasised law-abidingness would not have saved the apostles from their fate in real life.

c) *The alleged disunion in the synedron over the course of action against the apostles*

This disunion is particularly emphasised by the theologians, in order to explain, why at first, the community could spread fairly unhindered. According to the description of the Acts, it was merely, or at least most predominantly, the with the high priests closely affiliated *Sadducees* who were active as the persecutors of the apostles. That is, because the Sadducees were "deniers of the resurrection", and therefore, they naturally had to take offence with the claim, that the human being Jesus had risen up from death. Since on the other hand, the Pharisees did believe in a resurrection – so the author of the Acts continues demonstrating – these Jews could actually not find the proclamation of Jesus' apostles punishable, which is also the reason, why a prominent member of the Pharisee party, Gamaliel, in a court session, gave the advice to not proceed by force, but to tolerate the Christians' movement, and to leave the ultimate outcome to Jahve. On this, *Weizsäcker* has already made himself known: "*The Pharisees cannot have favoured the christian community. We would have to give up our entire best evangelical tradition, if we wanted to forget, that they were the actual opponents of Jesus and his cause. How should that have changed in one blow? May the apostles... have*

kept themselves free from accusations towards the requirements of the law as much as they wanted, but the Pharisees could not bear, that now, the name of the only just executed one was held up high."¹¹² We can see with satisfaction, how *Weizsäcker* examines the paper-made "facts" of the Acts in the light of reality, and is bold enough to take the consequences.

If even such a sudden – after barely a year occurring – and complete turnaround, the way it has supposedly happened with the Pharisees, is most improbable per se (because there is no sufficient cause apparent in this case), then the improbability completely turns into impossibility, when we get the following points clear: even if the Pharisees had believed in the resurrection – many Jews believed in a resurrection on doomsday – then in such belief lay by no means the admission, that someone who has allegedly *now already* risen up from death, would not perhaps carry on living on Earth modestly (in the sense of religious demands), but would be *elevated into heaven* by Jahve to be the world redeemer! After all, the apostles' proclamation just did not only consist of the statement of the "simple" resurrection, but beyond that, also contained all sorts of claims such as the "elevation to Jahve's right-hand side", which had to sound just as blasphemous to the Pharisees as it did to the Sadducees. However, another circumstance remains crucial: namely that in this case, the disciples miserably failed with the demanded *proof* of the allegedly occurred resurrection of Jesus. Thus, the Pharisees were also lacking any reason, to transfer, merely prompted by empty claims, their general resurrection belief onto this unproven special case which still furthermore carried the embarrassing complication of the "elevation". It goes without saying that in real life, Pharisees and Sadducees and all Jews would have agreed, that the claimed promotion in rank of the executed human being Jesus to redeemer-of-the-world meant the worst conceivable blasphemy, and that accordingly, action would have to be taken against the slanderers without delay. What is more, we know "historically", that yet a Pharisee, namely Saul-Paul, was the most embittered enemy of the Christians, whom he hunted up everywhere

in their houses, in order to deliver them to the court. If the theologians enjoy referencing, that the law-abiding Pharisees had shown friendliness to the Christians, because those had also been zealous law followers after Jesus' death, then this "explanation" very swiftly terminates itself by pointing to the discourse of the previous section: the Pharisees, too, would have considered the apostles malingerers. In real life, the apostles would not have even been given the time to excel in law-abidingness as Christians. Naturally, in real life, even the Pharisees would have been clear about the fact that with a toleration of the christian movement, they themselves would have put the axe to their law-religion. If only the belief in the elevated Lord could effect the rescue from eternal damnation, then what good was the observance of the more than many regulations of the law?

d) The circumstance, that the high council had not dared strongly intervene against the apostles for fear of the people

The concept of the Acts put the forgers before the literary task: to render conceivable, how it could be possible, that despite Jesus' catastrophe, his apostles, under the eyes of the enemies, were able to proclaim the nuisance-arousing Christ message, and could found a swiftly growing community almost unchallenged. The result of the long contemplation has come out right miserably;^{XLV} but it has to said to the writers' defence, that nobody at all is capable of solving the presented task psychologically believable. The forgers had no better idea than to set into motion their machinery with the proclamation of a general, total mental and character metamorphosis of the people involved in the drama. Firstly, they had the apostles over night transform themselves from law-free into law-abiding people. Secondly, the Pharisees are forced, also over night, to accept undergoing a transition from most embittered enemies to tolerant judges in the Jesus affair. And thirdly, the entire "people" is left no choice but to join

XLV I don't know about that; after all, this bunk has kept all of mankind rather busy for about a thousand or so years.

the general mood turnover in favour of the apostles. All we have to do now is to faithfully accept such total turnaround in line with the literary suggestion, and behold, the machinery seems to be functioning indeed. Only, we must not get around to thinking; only, we must not decide on judging the artificially hammered-together psychology of the acting persons in the light of real life! Else, we can see right through the affair.

We have already identified two "transformations" as fiction-made, what remains is to also reveal the third metamorphosis as an artificial product.

The turnaround in the mood of the "people" is not at all unskillfully explained as caused by the high esteem and reverence, which the apostles were enjoying everywhere because of their numerous "miracle healings". As a pure historian, I will yet again just assume, that those men were really capable of doing miracles. Now, what exactly was the success of such power deeds with the Jewish people? The Acts assert, that the wonders had made such an impression, that [as a result,] the miracle performers had love and reverence heaped upon them everywhere among the "people". With the *apostles*, this has supposedly well and truly been the case. Remarkable. Because we can prove "historically", that to the people in Jerusalem, such "wonders" meant nothing, purely nothing at all, that they indifferently ignored even the greatest miracles, as if they did not notice anything special. The greatest wonders could leave these Jews in Jerusalem so cold, that they, as everybody knows from the gospels, on a very well-known occasion, shouted their "crucify", although they were dealing with Jesus, who after all, had "really" not been avaricious with the very greatest miracle deeds. This is just how those Jerusalemers were: anybody could just come along, render hundreds of incurably ill ones sound, even re-awake the dead – if it should occur to this wonderful man to touch the law and Jahve the almighty, or even to blaspheme, then, despite all his great power deeds, he was done for, then he would be put to the cross despite his merits! And, what even the Acts have to involuntarily give away in one place:

Stephanus was also a great miracle performer, his deeds did in no way stand behind those of Peter and the other apostles; but peculiarly, the people to Jerusalem only shrugged their shoulders over it and remained comprehensively unimpressed. Namely, when one day, this Stephanus uttered disrespectful words on the law and the temple, he was – despite all his wonder deeds! – stoned by the outraged crowd. With the Stephanus example, we have thus the "historical" evidence, how effortlessly the "people" could be incited by their Jewish leaders, because back then, a general persecution of Christians was breaking out.

We now return to the apostles, to Peter and the other disciples, and recall to memory: that they, too, with their message of Jesus as the "elevated Lord" publically proclaimed blasphemous things, and that they used to perform their healings with demonic name magic. Should it in *this* case, of all cases, *not* have been possible for the synedrion to incite the "people", and to make the Jerusalemers realise that first off, the apostles are liars and fraudsters (because their resurrection proof has failed), but they are also impertinent hypocrites and malingerers (because they only want to disguise themselves with their law-abidingness), and what is the worst, with their "elevated Lord" and "world redeemer", they constantly blaspheme the almighty. After all, what does Stephanus' speech against temple and law even mean, when *on an hourly basis*, the apostles with their claims were violating the honour of the *almighty* himself in the eyes of the Jews?

Viewed in the light of real life however, all these considerations are meaningless and superfluous; because in rough reality, the apostles would have been arrested and rendered harmless during the first days of their public propaganda. So, as little as the apostles would have had time to publically prove their law-abidingness as Christians, they would have had equally as little public opportunity as Jesus proclaimers in Jerusalem to arouse sympathies by miracle healings.

And with this, we can draw the bottom line under the discourse over those "circumstances and causes" which had allegedly favoured the apostles and their Christ movement. It has turned out that in real life "at the times of the apostles", not a single one of the mentioned causes could have prevented the fate, which was threatening the first Jesus followers from the start of the public proclamation, from fulfilling itself. Why, these circumstances could not have "effected" anything for the reason alone, that they had not even existed in reality back then, but only represent fiction ferments, under whose imaginary propulsion the concept machinery of the christian primeval history should be set into "living" motion by the forgers. This endeavour has miserably failed however; even the resurrection proof has turned out to be a fragile fly-wheel of the apostle-fiction-machinery. On the basis of absolutely overwhelming evidential material, we could as early as now answer the central question: *was the alleged foundation of a primevally christian church even possible?* with an absolute: *No!* First however, the task is to still view a very last relative-critical emergency exit.

e) *Secret, undercover mission activity?*

Some theological critics are seeking to cancel or at least weaken the inevitable 'no' of the central question by the following explanations. They are happily agreeing with me, that the in the Acts described doings of the apostles in broadest public is a historical impossibility. In "reality" however, the propaganda activity of the disciples had not even proceeded publically, but had taken place secretly *and under cover*. We thus return to *Weizsäcker* once again, who had of course already recognised with an admirable sense of reality: any public advertisement "would without a doubt have been swiftly suppressed". He now continues writing: "*In the place of those ceremonial public sermons in Jerusalem stands...quite a different activity... this happens in all silence; they say it into ears, in the dark... It was a foregone conclusion, that the wandering [of the apostles in the land; K.] came to no rest. Oftentimes, the peace*

greeting was not received, the word rejected... Quite in the same manner...it has now without a doubt been operated in Jerusalem itself as well. Here, too, the beginning was not that there was speaking in broad daylight, and down from the rooftops, but the gospel was spoken in the dark into the ear."¹¹³ [Oh, please!] Other critics are also zealously hinting, that "in reality" and to the contrary of the details of the Acts, the first advertisement could only have taken place in the dark. So, *Knopf* reckons: "*This proclamation will mostly of course not have taken place in broadest public... but the dissemination of Christianity originated from the small communities, who came together in individual houses; mostly, the sermon went from ear to ear, the movement progressed from man to man. In Jerusalem itself, the disciples must have instantly had a big success with their opening sermon.*"¹¹⁴ Unfortunately, *Knopf* expresses himself plenty unclearly. "Mostly", the advertisement had not taken place in broadest public – so, in individual cases, it had yet! *Knopf* seems to view the opening sermon of the apostles in Jerusalem as a *restricted public* one, at any rate, not an *absolutely secret* one. Because the big success of this sermon assumes a very big audience, which could not have gathered in absolute secrecy. Does he perhaps imagine a propaganda speech in a so-called "closed society"? We may then not have publicity under the open sky, but publicity under the roof. This unclarity of ideas is also peculiar to *Weizsäcker's* discourse; this is shown by the sentence: *oftentimes, the peace greeting was not received, the word rejected.*

Weizsäcker seems to also operate with a "restricted" public; because he imagines the apostles not preaching under open sky, but wandering and advertising from house to house, also from locality to locality. Thus, the propaganda is not public, but not absolutely secret, either! This inner tottering of the ideas is already indicating that the structure of the theory of the undercover "advertisement" is not showing any particularly great robustness. Our following examination will fully support this first impression.

The theory of the secret and undercover advertisement rests on four columns (prerequisites). If these columns prove to be rotten, then naturally, the entire theory collapses.

The *first* prerequisite is, that the apostles must have succeeded in getting out of their master's catastrophe unharmed; be it, that they had saved themselves by timely flight, or that they had "sworn off" after their arrest, and had been set free by the synedrion with the warning to never have anything be heard again of the crucified one. Against all concerns, I want to just assume this very most favourable case now, and thus, rate the first presupposition quite optimistically.

Now, with the best of will, the second prerequisite is not particularly robust however. In their satisfaction over having rendered more likely the "possibility" of the primevally christian church formation by the hypothesis of the undercover advertisement, the critics do not even notice, that they are getting from a rock to a hard place. Because now, they put the author of the Acts (and themselves) in a not only embarrassing, but impossible situation. As is well-known, Luke reports that the sermons of the apostles had been held in all public from the beginning; if this is not true however, [i.e.] if "in reality", the apostles' appearance took place in the dark, in secret – then this "primevally" christian author must have been quite an enormous writer and liar! After all, in his "history", he simply turns things on their head. According to the prevailing opinion, Luke has supposedly written his *double-work* (the gospel and the Acts) in the 80s to 90s, hardly later than 100. *Harnack, Maurenbrecher* and others place the double-work even earlier, namely as early as in the 60s. Thus, barely 60 years after the "real" events, the author of the Acts would have told his co-Christians (and the opponents!) the most palpable untruths and fairy tale things about all-known things and events. The nerve of the author must have been gigantic, because 30-60 years after the events, there were still eyewitnesses (also enough opponents!) alive, who could have shown him to be a liar. Famously however, especially this Luke ceremoniously emphasises at the beginning

of his work, that he were only reporting the truth, and that he were supported by inquiries. Since in real life, such emphasis on the truth with an easily de-masked "writer" appears difficult to believe to thoughtful theologians as well, they fall back on the all-popular explanation, that Luke had by no means fantasised proactively, but were supported by "community tradition". And by this, to top it off, the curious "fact" of the epidemic memory weakness amongst the primeval Christians is being served up once again. When Luke was inquiring – at the latest, 60 years after the events! – memory among the Christians and opponents had already so faded, that even still living eyewitnesses had no longer been able to "remember". Or, much rather, they peculiarly remembered exactly the opposite of the truth! Although "in truth", the apostles' advertisement took place in secrecy, they now remembered that it had occurred in broadest public. Since in real life, a primevally christian author could not have simply turned all-known things on their head out of fancy and arbitrarily, a theory that is counting on such "fact" as unspoken presupposition must stand on quite shaky ground.

Things are standing still worse with the *third* prerequisite column of the undercover theory. Primarily, *Knopf* and *Weizsäcker* should just tell us their idea of advertisement in the dark and from ear to ear. Do they want to proclaim a "limited" publicity in a closed society, or an "absolute" secrecy? Unfortunately, they leave the choice to us, and do not commit themselves. So, if we first take the case of the limited publicity, then we do not require lengthy contemplation to realise, that the publicity under roofs would have proven barely any less dangerous than the publicity under open sky for the advertising apostles. Even from the closed societies of the christian house gatherings, the news of the alleged resurrection and elevation of the recently executed human being Jesus would have reached the high council. The synedrion would then have had the apostles swiftly arrested – in brief: the limited publicity would have evoked the same fate as the full publicity for the apostles. In real life, the Christ-hostile synedrion would under no circumstance have calmly left the apostles to be,

who were confusing the people with unprovable and blasphemous claims, just because they proceeded with their propaganda in the houses instead of under open sky. The assumption of a limited publicity as the third prerequisite and column of the theory thus collapses defencelessly.

This leaves the discussion of the absolute secrecy of the advertisement as the *fourth* prerequisite of the theory. So, the apostles were secretly and silently whisking through the alleys of Jerusalem, in order to disappear in this or that house. In the dark of covered rooms, there was frantic whispering, and the ones present were ordered to keep strictest silence. Naturally, they did not avoid the light because of their sensitive eyes, but because in those circles, it was known all too well, that trouble would be looming if the authorities, the synedrion, found out about the things being preached in secret. I hardly believe that *Knopf* and *Weizsäcker* had realised, into what terrible light they were putting Jesus' apostles, if with the advertisement "in the dark", they had meant to hint at the aspect of absolute secrecy. What has now become of the eleven humans who had, allegedly by apparitions, gained the certain conviction of the resurrection and elevation of their late master, and who in their enthusiasm left homes and families in order to proclaim the happy message to the entire people? They must have turned into coolly calculating advertisers. With such darkness-addicted, ice-cold pseudo-enthusiasm, the sneaks would not have gained many pious Jewish souls for their frantic message. We need not care for any of that however. We calmly set the case which the theory is demanding. Then, a question is surfacing however, on whose answer the make or break of the entire secrecy theory depends.

This question is: supposing that the apostles had given it their utmost to conceal their advertisement and their own comings and goings as well as that of Jesus' first followers per se from the eyes of the hostile Jew leaders – *would they have succeeded with their secrecy?* Would the secrecy have succeeded *completely*? Would it have succeeded *for years*? The

question has to be answered in the negative. Because if we insert the rough conditions of real life into the equation of the secrecy theory, then it easily follows that under those circumstances, this advertisement would have remained undiscovered for not even several weeks. In real life, the synedrion would have often made sure, how the after the Jesus catastrophe with justified suspicion persecuted apostles were behaving after their swearing-off, especially when they were staying in Jerusalem. For this alone, the apostles would not have found it easy to organise secret gatherings amongst themselves without soon being discovered. The danger of being discovered would grow enormously however, if in the meantime, they would have secretly met with the newly gained Christ believers for "breaking bread" in private houses. Just consider certain, not at all avoidable circumstances, which would sooner or later have to effect the discovery of the ongoing "secrecies", e.g. thoughtless utterances of the ones involved towards relatives and friends, who carelessly or deliberately spread their news and suppositions attached to them. Think of a coincidental surprise to the gathering by the neighbours, who then were keen to relate their spectacular knowledge to others. Primarily, it has to be considered, that back then as well, there would have been no shortage of informers and traitors. The apostles had once before seen a traitor among themselves.

However, the main danger was not threatening from the doings shunning the light and the potential bad character traits of the members already gained for the new faith, but it was threatening from the side of the Jews still to be gained by the apostles through advertisement. Even *Weizsäcker* cannot but admit the from that side looming trouble as existing in real life back then. His small sentence: *oftentimes, the peace greeting was not received, the word rejected* – speaks volumes in that regard. It is not necessary to once again recall the monstrous content of the message, with which the disciples wanted to gain the trust of their compatriots; because with words and claims meaning a horrible blasphemy to each pious

Jew, the eleven had to approach their co-humans. They had to turn to people of whom they would not have certainly known in a single case, whether their "word" would now be received or rejected by them. Without a doubt however, in real life of that epoch, to be rejected with this blasphemous message must have been the lot that the advertising apostles had drawn most frequently, why, almost regularly! And this fatal fact means, that even as early as with the first rejection, the danger of being discovered would have become and remained gigantic. Because if not already the first, then certainly the second or third one rejecting the word – because else, he would not have shown the advertiser the door – would have publically vented his anger. Thus however, the secret would have been revealed! And it would have taken barely weeks, until things would have been set in motion by a rejecting one. The apostles would then have been instantly arrested, sentenced and rendered harmless. Because the synedrion would not have set the rebels and blasphemers free for a second time.

The with some theologists popular explanation, that the secret propaganda had guaranteed "secrecy" for the movement, and as a result, a *christian community* could have been *founded*, thus also slams into the hard facts of real life. The certainty, that any potential advertisement in darkness could under no circumstances remain undiscovered for any length of time, knocks the entire secrecy theory over.

With this, the long discussion of the central problem of the entire christian primeval history is finalised. Its solution is this: since the apostles (as well as perhaps other Jesus followers), attempting an advertisement for the new faith, would have been swiftly arrested and rendered harmless, *the alleged foundation of a primevally christian community was per se impossible*. So, the christian church cannot have *the* origin, which the new-testamentarian sources, and in connection with those, the allegedly early clerical ones, are in vain trying to attribute to it. Now, since the christian church has in truth formed much later than is told, e.g. not only the with the disciples' and the »first Christians'« fate connected Saul-Paul is a fiction

phantom, but equally, the "early clerical" Heretics (such as Marcion and Tatian) and church fathers are totally invented figures. (Later investigations will reinforce this conclusion in more detail.) Our results of the third and especially the fourth chapter have clarified however, that the apostles and Jesus himself are invented personalities.

Book 3

The struggle for a historical core in the gospels

Introduction

To begin with, reference to the peculiarities of the *main subject* to be dealt with in this book is desirable for the understanding of the nature and structure of the following chapters. We will not, as before, concern ourselves with the "first Christians" overall, but from now on, our attention is focused on a certain circle in "primeval Christianity", namely the alleged authors of written records on the tradition of Jesus and his disciples, i.e. the so-called *evangelists*.

To a critical assessment, the literary main work of these primevally christian authors – the four gospels – offers mystery over mystery, over whose solution generations of theologians have been struggling in vain. In this, it is not about the *dogmatic content* of those scripts, but about formal things, about *the historical side of their existence*; it is about answering the questions: when have the gospels been created? Who has written them? And how did the authors go about the composition of their writings?

The main difficulty of this complex of questions becomes palpable, as soon as we have a closer look at the *gospel authors'* exceedingly *peculiar literary mode of operation*. What infinite effort has been made for two centuries to somehow render the alienating mode of operation of those authors conceivable. To this day, no critic has succeeded in finding a satisfactory explanation.

In this treatise, we set out to show that, and why, it is indeed impossible to explain the evangelists' mysterious mode of operation in a reasonable manner, as long as we cling to the unspoken assumption, that the authors of the gospel scripts have been men from the first (or second, respectively) century. As always, during our critique of the historical gospel mysteries, we will handle the *absolute method*, that is, this time, the "*primevally christian psychology*" of the authoring evangelists must be viewed under the magnifying glass.

Basically, all formal mysteries of the gospels' existence are of a psychological nature, and they can only be solved by systematically operating with evangelist psychology.

We are not only interested in the psychology of the gospels' authors, but we are equally as impressed by the psychological situation of the modern gospel *critics*. From the 5th chapter onwards, gospel critique's main and favourite subject of the last decades will be up for discussion: *the problem of the layer construction in the gospel of Mark*. The great zeal, with which especially liberal theologians, but also non-theologians, are looking for layers in the "first" gospel, is understandable. Namely, if it turns out, that the layers with the community legends can be neatly separated from the overall mass, then the most desperately desired "historical core" of Jesus' real history is automatically retained.

It is exceedingly interesting to observe, how the modern source searchers and layer separators proceed in their work. So, we will examine by several textbook examples, what the worth is of both their "critical" method and the thus gained results. How will this literary struggle for a historical Jesus end?

Bridge

The synoptical question and its solutions so far

As is well-known, the overall thesis, the way it has been proclaimed in Books 1 and 2 of the presented work, is this: the "history" of primeval Christianity, including the history of the alleged founder of the christian religion, is the fictionalised result of a medieval falsification action. In the first two books already, I have been able to list a long, stately series of palpable

reasons for the accuracy of my overall thesis. And the evidence reserve of what has been presented in the first two books, is not yet exhausted by a long way. So, with this presented third part then, I initiate a new offensive on a previously silent section of the primevally christian front.

This time, I do not even need to discover the new problem as such for myself, and drag it into the light: for around two centuries, it is most well known in the world of theology. Since those times, this problem is floating above the realm of the new-testamentarian critique. Which problem is this then? I am referring to the *synoptical problem*. Synopsis means summary; and our case has in mind a summary regarding the evangelists, although the fourth (John's) gospel is eliminated in this. Namely, if we compare the four gospels in wording and structure of their content, then the result is the diagnosis that on the one hand, John's gospel sharply contrasts the other three gospels, while on the other hand, the first three gospels (Matthew, Mark and Luke) show remarkable parallels amongst each other, in a way, that we can rightfully speak of a very tight relationship here, and indeed, with some goodwill, the reports of the three gospels can be sorted into an albeit quite affected "synopsis". Such synopsis', in the Greek text as well as in the German translation, are no rarity. I only mention here the well-known Greek one by Huck-Lietzmann, published in its 9th edition in 1936.

If we dive into the synopsis of the first three gospels, i.e. if we read and compare the – in the synopsis' neatly placed next to each other – places from the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, in which the authors report on the same point of the history of Jesus' life, then as critical readers, we are practically and constantly being pushed towards the big problem. It grows from the following observation: next to the already mentioned very close literary *relations* of the evangelists Matthew, Mark and Luke, which stretches into the finest details of the wording (of style and language), immediately, an equally strong *difference* of these gospels by form and content strikes the eye. We see the picture of a literary cluster, in which

threads of relations and differences are mutually entangled in a mysterious muddle. In this striking observation, the synoptical problem is rooted. It is this: *how is this remarkable phenomenon of a permanent mess of literary relations and oddness explained?* Supposing, the three synoptical gospels had formed independently of each other: then how shall we render the resemblances and finest corresponding details conceivable? Or, let us set the other case: these gospels stood – which cannot be denied at all – in some literary relationship with each other: how shall we now explain the stark differences on the whole as well as in the details?

That there is a tricky question waiting to be answered here, will perhaps not be evident to some readers at first glance. Probably already of course, they have found, as they reckon, the only correct solution quite by themselves. As an unbiased head, they perhaps argue thus: the relations are very easily explained by the obvious assumption, that the author of the second gospel had known and used, i.e. in parts literally copied, that of the first evangelist, and the third evangelist the scripts of both his predecessors. The discrepancies are also "easily" made understandable by the fact, that the second and third synoptist have not in all places faithfully copied their originals, but stylistically and by content remodelled some portions for some motivation or another. Unfortunately, such "obvious" solution can merely be rated a good idea, scientifically insignificant, simply because of the lack of any support by solid proof. If perhaps somebody would like to set out to scientifically justify this hypothesis, proclaiming a *utilisation* of the previous by the later writing evangelists, they would very soon realise just how exceedingly tough the synoptical nut is that they want to crack. To point out just *one* problem: it is by no means the case, that literary relations of writings were only to be explained by mutual acquaintance (usage); the relations can have formed in quite a different fashion as well. Establishing and explaining such relations' circumstances amongst handwritings is a fairly frequent business of critical philology. He who is familiar with its

methods, will now of course not offhand trace the relations of the synoptical gospels to a mutual usage, because they know, that the resemblance could potentially also have been caused by the following reason: *all three* evangelists could perhaps, without even knowing of each other, i.e. quite independently of each other, used *one shared original* (perhaps a primeval gospel).

So, the solution to the problem does not perhaps simply lie by the wayside, but has to be looked for on all sorts of possible ways like a needle [in a haystack]. The actual difficulties even only begin during the search. Fortunately, the search action has been going on for two centuries already, so that today, we can spare ourselves some useless work, if we know the history of these efforts.

Our problem is not perhaps a purely theoretical question. The sweat that so many theologians have sweated, persistently wrestling for a solution, and enjoy sweating over and over anew, serves an eminently practical affair. Of a real solution, we expect for example an answer to the important question: which evangelist has written his gospel *first*? In particular, the argument revolves around the temporal placement of the gospel of Mark. Is Mark the oldest evangelist? As is well-known, in the NT, Matthew ranks in first place, and according to early clerical tradition, Matthew has supposedly "indeed" written his gospel first. Still today, this tradition is zealously defended not only by all catholic theologians, but also by some orthodox-protestant ones, while the representatives of critical theology favour placing Matthew's gospel at the end, i.e. they consider it being written last.

To have full certainty on the consecutive order of origin is so uncommonly important to the theologian and each Christian for the fact that in principle, the reports of *the oldest* evangelist – since he is of course placed closest to the "historical" events – deserve the most trust regarding the "historical" authenticity and faithfulness. He who considers perhaps Mark

the earliest gospel author, will mainly refer to Mark (especially in cases of doubt or contradiction), when in search for the "most secure" reports on the person and teachings of the alleged founder of the christian religion.

Now that we have emphasised the theoretical difficulty as well as the practical importance of an accurate solution to the synoptical problem, we now move to listing the *most important attempts at a solution so far*.

1. *The hypothesis of a primeval gospel*. It has been pointed out, that literary relations of written works can be explained by the assumption, that their authors, independently of each other, had more or less faithfully copied an already existing "source". Lessing was the first to consider such possibility regarding the synoptists (Matthew, Mark and Luke); in doing so, he arrived at the hypothesis of an already before the synoptists existing *primeval gospel* of unknown origin, which had supposedly been written in Hebrew. The gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke were nothing but the partly corresponding, partly deviating *translations* of this lost old original into Greek. The yet missing scientific explanation of this primeval gospel hypothesis was then attempted by *J G Eichhorn*¹¹⁵. Under his hands however, the hypothesis took on quite a complicated form: namely, the "primeval script" had supposedly been circulating in three different "editions", and supposedly only been used by the synoptical authors in the form of two further "reviews". Thus, the *one* primeval gospel has transformed into *several* (merely mentally developed) specimen. Not even this splitting up occurred arbitrarily however: *Eichhorn* had to account for so many "reviews" of the alleged primeval script, in order to even be able to interpret certain literary phenomena in the synoptical gospels in some way. From this, right at the beginning, it can easily be recognised, how terribly difficult it is to find a solution which is equally conceivable and simple. Even back then, *Eichhorn's* attempt did not satisfy anybody, because it was operating with too many (only mentally developed) variables. Also, it would be inconceivable, how the many

for the Christians so valuable "primeval scripts" could have disappeared without a trace so shortly after their creation.

Schleiermacher's diegesen hypothesis (1817) turns out to be a variation of the pure primeval gospel hypothesis. Not *one* primeval script with its potential "editions", but from the beginning, *many* independently of each other created, written individual records or fragmentary memory sheets (diegesen) have supposedly served the three synoptists as templates. The indefensibility of this "flying sheets" hypothesis very soon also becomes apparent, when we want to use it in practical detail: especially the formation of the in the first three gospels existing, essentially equal blueprint of Jesus' life remains unexplainable in this way.

2. *The (oral) tradition hypothesis* equally shares with the previous one the methodical skeleton. While previously, it has been an unspoken assumption that a primeval gospel existed, which had been fixed in written form, the representatives of the tradition hypothesis feel the need to assume a *primeval oral gospel*. To *Herder* belongs the merit of having pointed out for the first time the oral hand-down (tradition) as the basis and the template of the gospels. In 1818, *J C L Gieseler* subjected himself to the task of extending this theory, whose essential thoughts are briefly the following: since during sermon and mission, the primeval apostles and first Christians were again and again forced to tell of Jesus' life and his teachings, an "orally fixed" form of the narration soon formed, an unwritten primeval gospel, in a manner of speaking. Then, when the desire arose to fix the oral mass of the tradition in writing, the three authors, independently of each other, set to work, and thus, the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke had been created. So, the solution to the synoptical mystery seems to be found, only, looks are deceptive here, too, as it turns out only too soon. Namely, we would have to practically assume memory factories with the primeval Christians, in order to find it believable that by content and blueprint, the "oral" primeval gospel should have taken

on *such uncommonly rigid* form, the way it would have to be demanded to render the into the last and finest wording stretching correspondence of the three synoptical gospels possible. Preaching must in part have consisted of "reciting" each individual tale of Jesus always and again with the exact same words. And as early as one decade after Jesus' death, such rigid uniformity should have become customary amongst the Christians! However, the more the critics emphasise – in order to explain the correspondence of the synoptists – the oral treasure of tales' early turning-rigid, the more they obstruct their own path of realising, from just exactly whence the great *discrepancy* of the first three gospels could stem. The one rules out the other of course. Naturally, on this cliff, some more recent researchers also fail, who have again warmed up the tradition theory in somewhat modified forms. Even the evangelist Luke himself has put an unmissable obstacle in their way. In the preface to his gospel, he explicitly mentions *many written* gospels that had allegedly already existed in his time; he gives no news of an oral primeval gospel as a rigid tradition unit. For the readers as well, it is time now for a reminder of the chapter of the second Book on the "epidemic memory weakness among the first Christians". There, we had to confront the monstrous "fact", that even on the very most important ongoing of Jesus' life, the apostles *remembered differently*! How does such "fluid" tradition, such diffuse memory content, rhyme with the assumption of a rigidly fixed, i.e. a by content and form unique oral primeval gospel?

3. *The utilisation hypothesis*'. The previously discussed hypothesis' were based upon the assumption, that the three synoptists Matthew, Mark and Luke had worked *independently* of each other, without knowing each other. By the followers of those theories, the parallels occurring between them [the synoptists] had been traced to the existence of a *shared template* that was imagined to be a (written or oral) primeval gospel. Quite a different assumption now seems to brighten up the synoptical darkness, and in the process, primarily seems to make the close relations between the three gospels more understandable. Is not the assumption, that the

three evangelists have *mutually known and used each other*, very obvious and almost natural? Allegedly, even the old church father Augustin represented such (pure) utilisation hypothesis. According to his view, the gospels have formed consecutively in the order, in which they are listed in the NT, and in the process, the later authors have viewed and utilised the earlier gospel scripts. With utilisation hypothesis', it becomes particularly clear, how tightly the synoptical main problem is connected with the sub-problem: *which is the correct consecutive order of the formation of the gospels?*

a) In line with the clerical view, the *Griesbach* hypothesis (1789) looks at Matthew as the first evangelist. Without the utilisation of older written sources, he has drawn from his memories, and set down his Jesus' experiences in a gospel. According to *Griesbach*, Luke has to be regarded the second synoptist; the latter has utilised the Matthew gospel as a source, and besides that, he took on some of the fluid oral tradition in his work. Mark then finally, as the last one, has merely written out the two existing gospels, and in the process, strongly abridged and shortened the scripts of his two predecessors. In times to follow, this hypothesis has found some prominent representatives. *F C Baur* and the by him founded "Tübingen School" have also taken on the blueprint of the *Griesbach* thesis, and performed noteworthy feats in its further extension. However, these critics have repositioned the main weight of the evidence procedure, inasmuch as they have not, as *Griesbach* had, been predominantly based upon literary observations, but on the presumption, that certain clerical-dogmatic trends (tendencies) in primeval Christianity had exerted authoritative influence on the formation and the content of the synoptical gospels. We can spare ourselves any closer inspection of this "purpose critique", because even among the critical theologians today, there is barely any doubt, that its preconditions (at least in the proclaimed comprehensive way) are untenable. On the other hand, *Griesbach's* literary-based thesis may and must still raise attention: namely for the assumption, that Mark is an abridged excerpt from Matthew and Luke, there

are at least some weighty reasons to be given. So, does the pure utilisation hypothesis in *Griesbach's* formulation bring the solution to the synoptical mystery? Unfortunately, no again! It is even being rejected by most more recent critics – and that with justification, because it is confronted by at least equally as strong counter-arguments.

b) *The hypothesis of the philologist Lachmann (1835)* carries out a thorough correction on the consecutive order of the formation. *Lachmann*, in a manner of speaking, is turning the *Griesbach* synoptical table. With the literary-critical method, he succeeded in procuring weighty reasons for the claim, that not Matthew, but Mark is the oldest evangelist. So, Mark is no longer supposed to be the last, but on the contrary, the first synoptist! And the way things are standing, indeed a higher degree of likelihood speaks for just this order. So, according to *Lachmann*, Mark wrote first; Matthew and Luke have then used his gospel as a template. In the year 1838, still two further researchers have decidedly professed the Mark priority, namely *C G Wilke* and *C H Weisse*. Since that time, the thesis of the temporal priority of Mark's gospel is still ever more consolidating amongst the critical theologians. Much of that is owed to the fact, that the Mark priority could very well be utilised as one of the two founding columns of a soon after upcoming new theory. There will be mention of this new theory momentarily, after we have first noted something on the consecutive order of the synoptists.

In the struggle for first place, Mark's gospel may have appeared to come out as the winner, but the war of opinions on the *second* (and third) place was not yet mediated quite so quickly and easily. It was attempted to rid the world of this insecurity, too, with the methods of the literary comparison and source critique. In the process, the attention was drawn to quite a *new kind of relations* that is shown *only* by *Matthew and Luke* mutually. Because in the gospels of Matthew and Luke, there is a great volume of Jesus' sayings that are completely missing with Mark. And remarkably (concerning both form as well as content), there is on

the one hand a striking correspondence between Matthew and Luke, and a great difference on the other. So, the synoptical mystery fact repeats itself here on a small scale. Concerning the consecutive order in question, the for repeated times performed analysis of the special relations details between Matthew and Luke has again turned out contradicting results. Who is dependent on whom, yes, whether there is even any mutual dependency to be assumed at all, cannot be said with sufficient certainty. Literary critique thus found itself like helplessly being chased around in a circle from the beginning. However, the previously mentioned *C H Weisse* (not a theologian by the way, but professor of philosophy in Leipzig, where he died in 1866) very soon stepped up with the claim of having found the "correct" way out of the dead end. In 1838, this amateur theologian put down the first foundation stones to that theory with his two-volume work "*The Evangelical History, critically and philosophically edited*", which is still today praised as the patent solution to the synoptical question by the majority of evangelical researchers. In line with its double-pole character, this new theory is called two-sources theory.

4. *The two-sources theory*. This by *Weisse* merely hinted-at blueprint of the theory has essentially experienced its completion by *H J Holtzmann*.¹¹⁶ Quite telling for the new solution is, that its dress has been patched up from pieces of the previously discussed hypothesis'. Since even the older thesis' have not perhaps been constructed into thin air, but find the relevant support in certain objective observations of the entirety of the gospels, i.e. they, one and all, contain a true core, so the thought to seek the solution to the synoptical question by way of a *combination* lay not too far off. And so it then happened, too. Both primeval-script and utilisation hypothesis (besides that, to more modest measure, the tradition hypothesis as well), from now on found *combined* use. By its name already, the new theory gives away its most important attribute: it assumes *two sources (primeval scripts)* as ultimate original material by simultaneously giving Mark's gospel a particularly important position. Namely,

the gospel of Mark (or a certain basic stock of that gospel, respectively) is proclaimed as the *one* written primeval source. The critics found themselves pointed towards the *second* primeval source, demanded by the new theory via the sub-problem of the established relations between Matthew and Luke only within the speech material shared by them. The old argument, whether Matthew had used Luke, or Luke had used Matthew regarding these speech portions, is decided by the theory to the effect, that no mutual utilisation even exists at all. The two later synoptists, or so it is explained, had independently utilised (besides the Mark gospel) yet another primeval script as template. Since this second source had supposedly consisted only of words (logies) of Jesus, it is called the *speech source* (also sayings source or logies' source, or briefly Q). Thus, the Mark source and the speech source are the two columns, on which the load of the two-sources theory chiefly rests.^{XLVI} Consequently, the inner stability of the entire theory depends on the robustness of the two supporting columns.

If we temporarily assume the two-sources theory to be correct and incontestable, then on the one hand, the synoptical problem were solved by its help, i.e. the muddle of the relations and the oddness would have found a satisfactory explanation. On the other hand however, nothing definite would thus have been said on *the complete origin* of the first three gospels. The synoptical question is thus still overshadowed by the more general question of the complete and definite origin of each individual gospel. This further-reaching question has naturally occupied the researchers equally as lively as has the specifically-synoptical one, especially since both mostly turn up intensely entangled. So, the question of the definite origin of the gospels can in no way be completely answered with the two-sources theory, even if it were "right". For that reason, they saw themselves forced to develop yet *other* "source". Proksch has recommended a solution attempt with three main sources. Streeter has

XLVI This is just far too silly for all of those words; to both you, dear reader, and me, it's just another time-waster of a track into nothingness, obviously.

suggested four mutually independent sources, and *Bußmann* has even operated with eight originals! Since in all of these hypothesis', the old "columns", too (Mark, also named G, on the one hand, and Q on the other), permanently assert their prominent position, some researchers already think themselves in safety, and perceive with satisfaction the great mystery riddle as solved. In 1923, in line with the majority of all critical theologians, *R Knopf* proclaimed: "*With the two-source theory, the synoptical question is ultimately solved.*"¹¹⁷

After all, we can sympathise even with a theologian who as a critic, ventures into the staggering and dangerous- unknown, and that they would again like to stand on solid ground which must naturally be historical-christian ground. If even this ground of the two-sources theory should prove to be fragile, then for many theologians, an unpleasant situation would arise. And behold: disaster-proclaiming voices already sound from the camp of critical theologians itself. The German publisher of the English script by *E C Hoskins*, *The Mystery of the New Testament*, 1938, states: "*In more recent times however... here and there in Germany, the faith in the so-called Mark hypothesis, primarily in the entire two-source theory, has been shattered, so that today in Germany, that theory is, albeit by still a vast majority of the scholars yet, no longer quite so generally accepted as should probably still be the case in England.*"¹¹⁸

In reality now, how do things stand with this two-sources theory? Has it "indeed" created a bit of solid ground?

We will have to intensely concern ourselves with this question in the following chapters.

I. Evangelist psychology

If the two-sources theory is to successfully defy all storms of critique, then primarily its two columns must prove to be absolutely steady. As is well-known, the supporting columns of the theory are: firstly, either A: the *gospel of Mark* immediately, or B: a *primeval Mark*, or C: a *basic script G*, and secondly, the *speech source Q*. For one, the theory claims the existence, or past existence, respectively, of these two sources, and secondly, the existence of dependency relations between the three (or the two, respectively) synoptical gospels and the named templates.

It is useful to begin a critique of the theory with an assessment of the basic script. The first question we raise is this: has a basic script even existed at all then? Certainly!, some critics directly answer and assert: G is handwritten before us even today! The synoptical basic script, as is frequently claimed, is supposedly identical with the canonical gospel of Mark. So, according to this view, our presently presented gospel of Mark has supposedly served the other synoptists as a source. The opinion, that the gospel of Mark had been the *immediate* (later) so-called basic script, and that in its presented form, has been used by Matthew and Luke, has been particularly supported in the decades after the creation of the two-sources theory, a.o. by *G Volkmar*¹¹⁹, *C G Wilke*¹²⁰, *Bruno Bauer*¹²¹, in more and most recent times, by *W Beyschlag*¹²² and *J Schmid*¹²³.

We pose the question: *Can the canonical Mark gospel have been one of the two main sources of Matthew and Luke?*

The question is to an outstanding degree of a philological nature, i.e. its answer must be sought preferably with the methods of literary critique. Practically, the task consists of performing literary comparisons of a philological-stylistic kind, reaching into the smallest

details, between the content of the Mark gospel on the one hand, and the stock of Matthew and Luke on the other. Besides such philological "lower" critique, which, in a manner of speaking, assesses the philological framework, and tightly connected with it, the "higher" critique, focusing the attention on the spiritual qualities of the framework content, sets to work. So, our critique will thus also have to move around those two planes. Now, a philologically untrained reader need not be scared off however; because fortunately, we are completely freed from this painstaking, philologically detailed work, since over the last hundred years, this necessary comparison preparatory work has sufficiently often and sufficiently thoroughly been performed by philologists and theologians. Today, the so zealously collected comparison results of philological work on the gospels stand before us as a tall, towering mass. All that is important is to productively utilise those results. So, the act of procuring the comparison material is no longer important at all, but since the material is gaplessly present, everything depends on how it is *assessed*! Therefore, even the philologically untrained reader can follow the course of our investigation without tripping.

With critical investigations, much depends on whether as many as possible, or even all relevant detailed questions can be joined to one *central problem*. Central problems formed in such manner resemble high look-outs, from whence the critic can take wide looks around, and spot the relevant problem's *essentials*. We can also reverse it, and say: from the discovery of the problem's essentials grows the central problem. Now, in our question (can the canonical Mark gospel have been one of the two main sources of Matthew and Luke?), of exactly what do the problem's essentials consist? Whether the gospel of Mark has been a source, will have to be established by the nature and manner of the *procedure during the alleged utilisation*. We will study, how the user-to-be (the evangelist Matthew or Luke) have treated their alleged template. By having thus the view focused on the *author*, we suddenly see flashing up the problem's essentials in this case. Because it has become clear to us, that

we must profess psychology here, authors' psychology! That is, not psychology of an author generally, but specific author's soul science of a *primeval Christian*! Not even now however, the essentials are fully recognised and exactly determined; because the assessment again, shall not be concerned with a primevally christian author in general, but with a *primeval Christian as a gospel author*! The essentials thus concern: evangelist psychology. The problem's essentials thus reveal themselves to be a psychological problem regarding primevally christian gospel authors. The formulation of the discovered central problem is no longer difficult now: *is it psychologically possible*, that in real life of primeval Christianity, two evangelists (Matthew and Luke) could have "utilised" a third (Mark) in *the same manner* as it must have been the case according to the comparison results, if the canonical gospel of Mark had been the template?

1. We begin with the *assessment of the author's psychology of the evangelist Matthew*. In the process, we will be referring to the observations regarding the literary comparison work, the way *P Wernle*¹²⁴ has pointed out, besides others. (The question whether the author "really" was the Jesus apostle Matthew needs not even interest us here. We focus the attention on the allegedly primeval christian author as such.) With the greatest interest however, we now notice how Matthew has supposedly proceeded during the alleged utilisation of the canonical gospel of Mark – and indeed, must have been proceeding, had Mark in its presented form been a source for him.

Mark, too, has handed down *Lord's sayings*. According to the presently discussed hypothesis, Matthew has now carried over such sayings from Mark's gospel immediately into his [own] gospel. That he copied such sayings of Jesus from his alleged source word for word, is not striking, but it simply goes without saying. Because as a "primeval Christian", Matthew had to, just like all his fellow Christians, perceive and honour speeches and sayings,

that had been handed down acknowledged as truth by "God's son" Jesus, as something high and valuable. After all, these speeches stood in a gospel, i.e. in a community script recognised by and through its use, just this gospel of Mark. And this gospel did not perhaps enjoy such high standing with the first Christians, because it put any old pleasantly perceived words into Jesus' mouth, but because the community, on the basis of witness statements, kept and honoured such in the gospel listed sayings as true utterances of their master. Vice versa, the recognition and the use of Mark's gospel protected its entire content, i.e. the in it existing Lord's sayings as well, from potential changes.

Let us now hear, how Matthew has treated the with Mark presented Lord's sayings during copying. That Matthew has performed *philological* smoothing on Mark's text – we want to let it go, because such thing would perhaps not yet have been rated a profanation, especially since admittedly, the Mark template is not exactly good Greek. However, it already comes across as embarrassing, that Matthew went on to philologically "improve" the by far greatest number of Mark's Lord's sayings. Even here however, his good intention of wanting to make the affair more understandable can be somewhat balanced with his christian reverence for Jesus sayings reported as true. Suddenly however, we encounter *factual* changes that Matthew applies to Jesus' sayings! Oftentimes, such changes consist of additions. Even now, we could still excuse this: Matthew supposedly has that which he has added drawn from the *oral* tradition; supposedly, he has replaced certain with Mark presented Jesus sayings by "better" preserved ones, or modified them, respectively. It really raises concerns to excuse such procedure regarding recognised Lord's sayings as still agreeable with the christian reverence; but we still want to suspend all concerns once more. What we now furthermore hear however, makes the likelihood ever more doubtful, that Matthew has faithfully referenced the oral tradition with his factual changes: Matthew has mixed "*arbitrary reflections*" with the Lord's sayings! Instantly, the suspicion rises, whether an

author who has been proven to apply "improvements" based on purely subjective considerations, should on the other hand have so painfully objectively interrogated the community tradition? We are not left in any doubt over this for long, because in a different place, *Wernle* has to hands-down admit: "*The most important group of changes of Lord's sayings are the rearrangements, mutilations and exacerbations, of which there are quite a number found with Matthew.*"¹²⁵ He who so carelessly handles recognised speeches of Jesus, the way Matthew must have done according to this, does not, in other cases, strictly refer to the "oral" tradition when wanting to "improve", but he simply makes arbitrary changes.

"*What are we to think of the author*", another researcher rightfully asks, "*if he had high-handedly changed the words of the master so, that on occasion, he has him say the opposite of what it had said in his source?*"¹²⁶ Let us further note, that even with the *narrations* presented by Mark, Matthew has not only permitted himself to change style and vocabulary, but to sometimes *arbitrarily* modify the content by omission or contraction in a way, that "coarse violations" occur – then we feel like watching an author at work, who rates and treats his (sanctioned!) template in exactly the same way as he would a random literary work that must be arbitrarily and most zealously "improved".

Certainly! This is basically how things stand! – reckons theologist *A Jülicher*: "*To them [Matthew and Luke; K.], Mark is of course not a holy author, whom they feel indebted to literally copy and equally quote...*" Matthew and Luke "*have heard told stories and words by the Lord else as well, in church and in the private sphere*".¹²⁷ So, according to *Jülicher*, the users of Mark felt "*justified throughout in handling the details with poetic liberty*". All critical theologians think on this point what *Jülicher* does. In the liberal camp, they simply find that it "goes without saying", that the evangelists have reprimanded their predecessor without any pangs of conscience. Here, an attitude towards primevally christian evangelist

psychology comes to light, with which we must concern ourselves a little more still. With those researchers of course, it is the old tale and toil: their entire new-testamentarian critique resembles a ship lacking the rudder, namely the method. If as historians, these theologians could at least apply the obsolete monks' and relative method, which consist of the following procedure, as the reader can see from my previous writings: one part of the from books developed alleged earlier reality is compared relative to another part of this book reality. But not even such relative procedure is deemed necessary by those critics, when it comes to evangelist psychology. To them, the comparison with Mark simply proves, that Matthew has "indeed" treated his predecessor with literary arbitrariness. They are so beaten down by this "fact", that they cannot even wonder about it anymore. If on the other hand, they were examining the so-called fact methodically, by critically comparing the evangelist psychology with the primevally christian general psychology, they would perhaps begin to wonder about some things yet again.

Namely, the evangelists must not be viewed as sovereign spirits, who loftily work in a closed-off sphere of existence above the rest of the christian world. They stood in the middle among the "remaining" Christians and lived, thought and felt like their fellow faithfuls.* However, how did things now stand with the "remaining" world of Christians regarding the by *Jülicher* raised question, whether "one" would have viewed and revered a "holy" book in Mark's gospel, or not?

* Once again, it is pointed out to the reader, that in all these investigations, for tactical reasons, and against better knowledge, it is assumed possible that the in the NT reported primevally christian events were based upon real history.

If Mark's gospel has supposedly been used by both the other synoptists as a source, then it is assumed, that just this gospel of Mark had been the *earliest* gospel work. We now ask: just

why would Matthew and Luke have used this older gospel? And why has the gospel of Mark even been preserved? For the reason, that this (allegedly) first book about the life of the redeemer is not a book like any other, but because it was a book of quite peculiar significance and quite particular value, and because this first gospel, for its extraordinary content, had been *recognised as true* by primeval Christianity, particularly by the primeval apostles as well. With the recognition however, *reverence* and the *preservation of the holiness* was immediately given. In "real" life of primeval Christianity, it goes without saying, the recognition by the apostles and leaders would have been preceded by an exact examination of the "accuracy" of the content. Only after the in Mark's gospel fixed words and deeds of Jesus had been testified and sealed as true and authentic by eye witnesses (simply by the apostles), the recognition would have been proclaimed. With the recognition was thus the entire content of the script sanctioned! In real life, doubts over the accuracy of the narration would have risen sooner, namely prior to or with the introduction of the first gospel. The sanctioning proves however, that potential doubts would now have been regarded as eliminated.

How thoroughly Mark has been sanctioned, follows from the fact, that Matthew as well as Luke could not avoid respecting for example the chronological-geographical blueprint of the "oldest" gospel, and the with Mark fixed folkloristic idiom of Jesus as "true". So, not perhaps the *author* Mark mark was kept sacred – naturally, *Jülicher* is right in this – but his book, his gospel, or much rather the *content* of the book was revered. Be it emphasised once more then: the gospel of Mark must have been "officially" recognised, if it wanted to even find admission to the community. And the recognition, and then the use in the communities, would have automatically lent this gospel an authority and sanctioning, which nobody would dare touch in times to follow. No "ordinary" Christian, and no evangelist would have dared that!

It would not have been a frivolous violation of the sanctioned content, had a *completion* of the first gospel been intended, perhaps by additions of new (but also sanctioned!) Jesus sayings or deeds. However, this is not at all what the here questioned arbitrariness procedure by Matthew in the treatment (abuse!) of Mark's gospel is about. It is not being reprimanded that Matthew has made additions, but that he has supposedly arbitrarily improved sanctioned words of Jesus! In real life, the evangelists as well would have kept a sanctioned script such as the Mark gospel exactly as sacred, and would have respected its entire content, as the remaining Christians would have. If necessary, the [act of] respecting would have intensely been brought to their consciousness by their brothers in faith. A critique would not have remained unnoticed, but would have become immediately apparent with the publication of the new gospel by Matthew. By comparing the new gospel with the old one, the change would have been readily recognised.

The following objection would still be possible, and shall therefore be briefly dispatched: the gospel of Mark has "presumably" been created in Rome; Matthew's gospel has allegedly been authored in Palestine. We need to merely assume now, that Mark's gospel had been simply made known only in Italy. Then a critique of the "foreign" book by an author from the orient would not have been perceived as a declaration of discredit, because here of course, they could not refer to Mark's gospel for comparison. This objection is now being knocked over already by the fact that at any rate, Matthew (and also Luke!) must have yet evidentially known Mark's gospel very well, since else, they could of course not have written it out. Should these two evangelists have been the *only* Christians in Palestine and the surrounding area, who possessed a (secretly kept) knowledge of the existence of that foreign work? By the busy traffic of the Roman Christians with the homeland of their founder, well-evidenced by miscellaneous "old" news, this assumption must be most decidedly rejected.

Much rather, Mark's gospel must have been disseminated even in the orient very soon after its creation.

Summarily, we note: in real life of primeval Christianity, there could be no mention of "poetic liberty" to the degree, to which Matthew would testify, had he used the presented gospel of Mark. As a *Christian*, the author of Matthew's gospel would have vividly perceived the impropriety of such behaviour himself; else, his community brothers would have opened his eyes on this point without hesitation. However, could the critique, and thus the rejection of the oldest gospel not perhaps have taken place under general acceptance of the community leaders, i.e. on the basis of an official "conspiracy", as it were? For one, speaking against this is the fact, that the not much later writing Luke – assuming that Luke is the last synoptist! – had yet again used the old banned gospel, which would mean and assume a continued recognition. For another, the "conspirators" would have performed a wholesale job to fulfil their purpose, i.e. they would have let the banned old gospel disappear altogether; just like many other gospels have gone under without a trace all by themselves, as is well-known! Naturally, the alleged conspirators would have previously made sure, whether a disappearance of the gospel of Mark was even possible.

We must not forget: after all, the gospel of Mark – according to the here discussed prerequisite – is supposedly the oldest by primeval Christianity recognised and sanctioned written work of that kind. Its recognition assumes, that it offered the truth on Jesus and his teachings, so that each true and right faithful Christian could, and had to, avow the here proclaimed truth. Only a *Heretic* could object to the written down truth sanctioned in the gospel of Mark; they would then have been excluded from the community of the right faithful Christians however. In times to follow, the right faithful Christians (the "church") would never have also recognised as "true" and permitted for community use a later Matthew gospel (or Luke gospel), had those scripts been previously branded as originating from Heretics.

However, never has for example the Matthew gospel been banned as a Heretic script by the primeval Christians; soon after its creation, it has much rather been marked as the work of the apostle Matthew by "right faithful" church fathers!

2. Has Luke used the Mark gospel in its presented form?

As is well-known, Luke has supposedly utilised Mark's gospel as one of his two main sources as well. The issue is whether he could have used this gospel in its canonical final form. First off now, regarding Luke's utilisation procedure concerning the allegedly in his template presented *Lord's sayings*, *Wernle* gives an interesting comment. "*In their form, those [the Lord's sayings; K.] have been perceived as authoritative from the beginning. Everything depends on the truth and robustness of these words. It has to be expected a priori that here, Luke's liberty is limited the most.*" These are golden words, pointing to contemplation of the primeval christian situation! With this, *Wernle* involuntarily confirms our previous explanation, that in "real" life of primeval Christianity, sanctioned Jesus words would not have been permitted to be "improved". Luke has therefore principally abstained from a modification of such Lord's utterances? Remarkably, no! Because: "*Lord's sayings copied word for word are pretty rare.*"¹²⁸ This would not be so bad however, since for the time being, these are only slight *linguistic* changes. Understandable, that Luke for example "*possibly expunges the Aramaic foreign words [with Mark; K.]*". Why does he not expunge *all* Aramaic words though? Furthermore, what are we to think, when *Wernle*¹²⁹ must establish, that Luke, on the other hand, "*in his introductory formulations, has possibly outdone the original by a Hebrew-ising style*"? With the best of intentions, we cannot work out just what Luke's idea has been: did he want to expunge the Hebrew-Aramaic, or did he want to introduce it? We have thus already discovered a good portion of arbitrariness even with Luke.

Naturally, observations on how Luke has treated the Jesus words of his alleged template *in terms of content*, are more important. After all, such once sanctioned words of the redeemer have been perceived as authoritative by the primeval Christians. We have to hear deplorable things even about Luke however: "*At times, he has been commenting the Lord's sayings for his readers, and in that way, has created new Lord's sayings.*"¹³⁰ On one occasion, "*Luke has so unfortunately commented, that he has quite destroyed the original meaning*". With this, it is stated in plain terms, that *even Luke, exactly like Matthew, has criticised sanctioned Lord's sayings, i.e. he has changed them arbitrarily!* In often very incisive fashion in terms of factuality, Luke has also modified the *narration's fabric* of his Mark template. "*Even here, it can be said, that with permanent reflection..., he has redesigned his template. A historical value can nowhere be attributed to his »improvements«.*" Such samples are fully sufficient to clearly recognise Luke's basic stance towards his Mark template: *he does not respect it, he masters it!* His utilisation procedure resembles that of Matthew to the T. We must therefore speak out the same verdict even over Luke, as we did over his predecessor. It is this: the with Matthew and Luke established utilisation tactics are incompatible with the basic mental disposition of a primeval Christian. From which follows, that neither one, nor the other evangelist could have known and used the Matthew gospel *in its presented final version*; both must have much rather copied a *different* form of the alleged Mark's gospel template. A so-called "primeval Mark" could be an option, and this primeval Mark hypothesis must concern us soon.

II. An intermediate act: John and the synoptists

The disrespectful arbitrariness that is surfacing in the utilisation procedure of Mathew and Luke, *if* the canonical Mark gospel had been their source, has opened our eyes to the fact, that the Mark gospel (assuming it had even been a "template" at all) could have served the two evangelists as a template only in one "essentially different" design each. In terms of content, these other Mark versions must be constituted so, that from the peculiarities of this template text, the utilisation procedure as a faithful copy could be rendered conceivable, by which Matthew and Luke would be purged of the accusation of arbitrariness. However, before we commit to a discourse on such hypothetical pre-forms of Mark's gospel, we would like to, in an intermediate act, make the beneficial acquaintance of a "primevally christian" author, whom we may call *the great arbitrariness evangelist* with full justification. This is none other than the author of the fourth gospel, called John.*

* Again, with the current focus of the investigation, we can remain indifferent to whether really the favourite disciple John, or whoever else, was the author of this gospel; because the reader already knows from the overall results of the previous discourse, that in truth, no "primeval Christian" could even have been the author.

John, the alleged author of the fourth gospel, is not counted among the synoptists. Towards the first three evangelists, he represents an explicitly exclusive stance, so that the content of his script cannot, or only under the greatest luxations, be brought to a "synopsis" with the content of the scripts of his predecessors. He who steps across from the realm of the synoptists to that of John, has the feeling of going from one continent to quite another, this is how completely changed the overall character of the evangelical "historical world" appears. Now, in this intermediate act, it is not (as previously with Matthew and Luke) about the question: in what utilisation relations does John stand with the gospel of Mark? But this time,

for a change, the relations of the fourth evangelist with all three predecessors (Mark, Matthew and Luke), i.e. with the three synoptists overall, come under the critical magnifying glass.

In order to even reach the mental phenomenon calling itself the evangelist John, we have to climb a whole set of stairs of the most daring prerequisites. We must decide on *assuming* that in the christian communities, at least already three recognised gospel scripts (Mark, Matthew, Luke) have existed and been in use, when relatively late, yet another author, "John", also decided upon authoring a gospel.

So, he writes a gospel. Well, *but how does he write it? He invents himself one!* Namely, if John had not been a fictionist, then invariably, the three synoptists must have been fictionists. Either this – or that! (Naturally, this either-or is valid only temporarily. In truth, this is of course a case of as-well-as.) Namely, the fourth evangelist, with truly child-like carelessness, is knocking the entire synoptical "history"-world to pieces, and is building, i.e. fictionalising a new world. He rates only a few measly pieces of rubble of the knocked-over synoptist glory worthy of being used in his new structure. We have this confirmed for us by a researcher as follows: "*The first impression that we gain on comparison of the John gospel and the synoptists is that of a complete difference of the fabric. John shares only little of [that] fabric with the other gospels, and even in the shared material, there is no full correspondence.*"¹³¹ "No full correspondence" – that still sounds quite harmless. Just how things are really standing with the correspondence, another theologian describes with a clarity that leaves nothing to desire: "*After all, [next to Jesus' speeches; K.] also the facts of Jesus' life, the timeline, the locality, the consecutive order of events, the dramatical construction of the whole, the course of the trial in Jerusalem and many other things with John are so different from the description of the older gospel..., that in the view of many researchers, these factual deviations... make John's gospel appear totally useless as a historical source.*"¹³² By this list, we can recognise, that John's critique of the "truth" of the synoptical

narrations is going all out. One of the most striking corrections has already been remembered in the 2nd Book: John has stretched the duration of Jesus' public activity from one year (with the synoptists) to around three years. At this moment, with this phenomenon, we are exclusively interested in *the psychological* problem that the author of the fourth gospel has posed us. How does he arrive at the risk, to offhand knock over a fact known and recognised as truth by all Christians for decades – the activity's one-year duration?

There could be a simple solution to this problem, some researchers reckon, namely the following: the author of the John gospel "*could not very well be guided to such a deviating description by anything but the conviction of his narration being in line with the truth*".¹³³ [*rolleyes*] So, John believed, no, he had the firm conviction of being better informed on the truth, and was therefore permitted to correct with a clear conscience. He who can present this explanation with a straight face, betrays a lack of critical insight; because they have simply not consciously registered the main difficulty (the either-or). Because by such explanation, not only the three first evangelists, but the first Christians overall are imputed the stupidity of not for example having known for how long Jesus had been publically working amongst them! After all, not only perhaps John had accompanied the master, but also a series of other disciples and many followers. From own experience, they were all equally well informed as John on such important facts. In real life, they could *not* have forgotten such things even by force; the suspicious opponents would have readily made sure of that with each opportunity.

This fatal either-or has robbed some critics of their peaceful sleep. They have sought and researched, and finally believed having found, that in some places in the synoptists description, it *appears, as if* even the first three evangelists were "basically" counting with more than a one-year duration of Jesus' activity. Indeed, some observations in the synoptical gospels can be *interpreted* in this direction. But what does that prove? That a new

psychological problem is becoming noticeable here. Because now, the three first evangelists are turned into secret-mongers. In their scripts, why do these three authors only very, very vaguely hint at the with all primeval Christians – i.e. with themselves, too – well-known "fact" of the activity's three-year duration. Against the to themselves and to all the world well-known truth, why do they put in the monstrous effort to chronologically press and model their material so, that everybody *had to* conclude, that the Lord had publically taught for only *one* year? What in all the world moved these evangelists to only vaguely hint at the truth? And not only one, but all three synoptical evangelists should have been constructing so uncommonly artificially, so that only with effort, we can see still some traces of the suppressed truth shimmering through? If these men were intent on suppressing – then why did they not do it thoroughly? Also: the Christians who of course knew the true facts of the matter should have accepted such twisting and veiling in all soulful peace? Here, one psychological impossibility is heaped on top of another.

Let us return to John however. He has supposedly been convinced of the truth of *his* description. What? And previously then, he could have remained silent for decades with a clear conscience, when he saw, how Matthew, Mark and Luke served up to the stupid, forgetful Christians the most coarse untruths about the master and his work? In "real" life, he could *not* have remained silent for that long, if he did not want to feel to be a traitor on the truth (of which he was convinced!).

The favourite disciple John however, is not even the author of the fourth gospel – so probably say the majority of the critical theologians. An eyewitness could not even be the author of this script; because "naturally", the synoptists were right and John, i.e. the anonymous author of the last gospel, were wrong. On the one hand, only quite "radical" theologians offhand declare John a fictionist. In general, the excuse is used, that the so late

writing evangelist, as a man of the second Christian generation^{XLVII}, has been describing the things more simple than upright, just the way he "knew" them, although he could not quite avoid interspersing his subjective perception, either. This seeming way out, on the other hand, only leads to new, insurmountable difficulties. It is of no use, either, to assume the subjective perception of certain *dogmatic tendencies*. Assuming, any old christian Anonymous of a later generation (perhaps around 100-110 A.D.) had decided on the plan of presenting certain novel dogmatic tendencies in the dress and make-up of an evangelist foisted on the favourite disciple, then this man himself would of course not have unnecessarily made his precarious cause more difficult. If the Anonymous was no dumbhead – and he was not one, going by the brilliant content of his work – then he would not have dreamt of proactively rubbing it into all the world's face, that his John gospel is a flat invention; then he would not have seriously dreamt of setting up his action so, that he himself would recklessly jeopardise the final objective of his plan for a pure sentiment of resistance. So, he was intent, by inventing a gospel foisted on the apostle John, on erecting novel dogma statements as already stemming from Jesus – that was the explanation of some critics, after all. Well, why then does he not take both the sanctioned framework and the required amounts of material for his description *possibly unharmed* from the recognised scripts of his predecessors? Why does he not content himself with cleverly having his own newly production consist of smuggling the new dogma statements into suitable places of the "authentic" tradition? Why does he by all means have to stand the all-known "historical" truth on Jesus' life's events on its head? Only a dumbhead – and the Anonymous was truly not one – would thus have so recklessly made himself vulnerable by cheekily denying and correcting "facts" from Jesus external life known to everybody.

XLVII That doesn't even make sense, that a 'man of the first hour', the favourite disciple, is turned into a second generation Christian here, just because he must have been at least a hundred or so when he 'wrote'. Or am I missing something?

When it comes to denying most well-known "facts", this "John" has some to show for, and cannot do enough. In principle, he simply denies everything. Like the chronology, John has also thoroughly changed *the locality* of Jesus' work. *"Every reader... knows the striking difference regarding the locale... According to the synoptists, Jesus works in Galilaea; now, shortly before the death passover, he goes to Judaea and Jerusalem. In John's gospel however, Judaea and Jerusalem are the actual stage of Jesus' messianic activity."*¹³⁴ Even here, many researchers come to the defence of the fourth evangelist, by declaring, that John has really reported the truth. [Seriously!?] Why, "actually", there were not even a contradiction with the synoptists present in the question of the locality, because *"even in the synoptical reports, there is no lack of traces [!; K.] of having this news [on Jesus' repeated stay in Jerusalem and Judaea; K.] still clearly shimmer through"*.¹³⁵ So, time and again, his "love of the truth" has driven this belated gospel fictionist to bring "lies" of the synoptists to light. He knows it quite exactly: the temple cleansing belongs to the beginning of Jesus' career (not as the synoptists, one and all, claim, to the end!). He knows it quite exactly: not on the 14th Nisan (as the synoptists report), but on the 13th Nisan, Jesus has held the last meal with his apostles!

For bible readers who think and make comparisons when reading, i.e. particularly for theologians, such obvious contradictions are thorns in the mental side. Infinite efforts have been wasted in vain on the task, to balance the embarrassing contradictions by so-called harmonisation, i.e. to veil them, and to talk them out of existence. All the more do the following open-hearted words of the evangelical researcher *F Heitmüller* deserve appreciation: *"For the pious bible reader, wanting to balance and eliminate these differences is probably a natural endeavour. It is impossible however, and it simply is the duty to honesty... to acknowledge this fact."*¹³⁶

What could it be, that moved this mysterious and obstinate fourth evangelist himself to still put into the world such noteworthy gospel of the "purest truth"? – so have already many new-testamentarian researchers asked. It is considered that he could have had two things in mind. Did he want to merely *complement* the gospel scripts of his predecessors, or did he want to *supplant* them? Some theologians reckon, that he wanted to complement the synoptists (and quite on the side, correct them). This assumption seems to find confirmation by the fact, that (as already mentioned) the John gospel shares only little of the narrative with the synoptical gospels. The largest part of the fourth gospel brings completely new material, so that we could well talk of a complementation. So, peacefully, for the completion of the series, our author wants to place himself next to his predecessors. However, the supplement hypothesis already becomes a little doubtful, when we hear *just what the first evangelists* permitted themselves to *forget*. What? *All* other evangelists should have completely forgotten for example so striking an event as the foot-washing (which only John "remembered")? Equally the resurrection of Lazarus, which again, only John kept in his memory? However, since such newly material is judged by many critical theologians themselves to be obviously invented (potentially by the community legend, not the author!), we do not want to accuse the synoptists of the "forgetfulness" regarding such ongoing all too much; because the completion hypothesis receives its first hard blow by the question: if the author wanted to "complement and correct", then why has he *repeated the named shared pieces* (feeding and walking on water, temple cleansing, anointing in Bethany, entry in Jerusalem)? However, the hypothesis receives its death blow by the consequence of the following consideration: if John had wanted to complement the synoptists, i.e. if the other three gospels were to remain in standing and reverence next to his description, then the gospels of his predecessors had to really only be complemented; then, at least by and large (regarding all-known facts), the earlier gospels had to be respected, but not be criticised and questioned with an unrivalled

ruthlessness. In that case, it seems to be clear, that John had wanted to *supplant* the synoptists, other researchers reckon. E.g. *Heitmüller* has not the least doubt about this. "*Much rather, it is quite clear, that he wants to replace and supplant the synoptical gospels. His gospel shall be the gospel.*"¹³⁷ It is either-or, *Heitmüller* says to himself; either John wants to complement, or he wants to supplant. The only clear thing about the supplantation hypothesis is, that it must fail miserably. The merciless critique of the other gospels may now theoretically be well understood equally as good and inevitable preparatory work and condition for their supplantation; but just merely *theoretically*. After all, in real life of primeval Christians, how could a christian author – and be it even the favourite disciple – fall for the frantic thought of viewing sanctioned gospels as waste paper. Recognised and in their entire content sanctioned community scripts, the way the synoptical gospels should have been in real life, scripts, whose as "true" testified content obliged every Christian in their entire life's design, did not only enjoy a particular, but the highest reverence, they enjoyed truly canonical reverence. It would mean playing with words, wanting to characterise the standing of such gospel scripts as extraordinary, as most high, but not as canonical. Those gospels have simply become "canonical" by their sanctioning. At any rate, they had become sufficiently canonical so as to not permit being suddenly "supplanted", i.e. being thrown on the scrapheap like meaningless irrelevant ware – the way the supplantation hypothesis demands.

The supplantation hypothesis ultimately breaks apart on the following consideration: how can John with his gospel be wanting to supplant the others and replace them with his gospel, if in his description, he *omits* the very most important, by all means *necessary constituents*? – I just name the institution of the supper, and the sermon on the mount and that in the field! After all, besides other most important pieces, the "replacement" had to by all means offer the institution of the Lord's supper, if the old gospels were to be "abdicated". It is

of no use either, wanting to talk oneself out of this by claiming, that the institution of the holy meal could well have been omitted from the replacement work, because by the long use of the other gospels, this event has meanwhile been sufficiently strongly imprinted in the memory. Quite besides the fact that with such "explanation", the omission of all of Jesus' words and deeds per se could be "justified": why then has John *carried over a series of less important segments from the synoptists, and not omitted them?*

No matter from which side we are facing the interesting problem called evangelist John, a practicable path to its solution will simply not be found; the theologists are uselessly wasting their entire stock of acumen to force an access to the solution. And they still have not yet noticed, that they are being made fools by this problem.^{XLVIII} By our investigation however, the reader has been enabled to also see this "historical" phenomenon in the right light, and to see through its secret. The phenomenon "John" is no product naturally grown in real life of primeval Christianity, but an artificially generated mental phantom. The gospel of John has not been authored by a primeval Christian, but has received its existence in much later times, and in a quite different environment.

III. More on the critique of the two-sources theory

The intermediate act on John is over, and we can now again turn to the critique of the two-sources theory. As we remember, the theory is based on the assumption, that *one* of the two main sources for Matthew and Luke had been the gospel of Mark, if not in its presented form, then simply in a more or less deviating primeval form. The discourse in the 1st chapter has

XLVIII And we have been made fools, for wasting the power and acumen of generations of good men and women to consider this crap, instead of chasing the messengers to the devil, where they belong.

clearly suggested, that (for psychological reasons) Mark's gospel in its final version cannot be considered the sought after source. There is still this second possibility remaining: one (or one each) essentially (or at least slightly) *differently* designed primeval form has served the two later synoptists as a source. With this, the *primeval-Mark hypothesis* moves into the critique's field of vision.

Assuming, a primeval Mark had existed, then it would follow, that not only Matthew and Luke had used this primeval gospel, but that yet one other unknown third party, an "editor", would have to be assumed, who had completed the design from the primeval form to the canonical final-Mark-gospel. From now on, this "finaliser" of the Mark gospel must no longer miss out on our attention.

As its name suggests, the primeval-Mark hypothesis assumes *one* certain earlier form of the Mark gospel as *the* primeval form. During literary operations however, difficulties with such a rigid primeval form have arisen; today, they seek to clear those [difficulties] by accounting for not one, but *multiple* pre-forms; the rigid form has been transferred into the fluid literary state, as it were. Practically naturally, this fluid state of the primeval form seems to force itself onto some researchers, when they picture the fate of the Mark gospel in primevally christian "reality". Such gospel must have been in motion, under development, these researchers have explained. Finally, their zealous search for suitable pre-forms has arrived at a so-called synoptical *basic script* (G), which has proven to be very suitable for the liquefaction into multiple sub-forms.

We begin the continuation of the critique of the two-source theory with the primeval-Mark-hypothesis.

1. *The rigid primeval-Mark hypothesis*

The hypothesis generally accounts for a pre-form, which was *not* essentially different from the final gospel: because predominantly, the differences are supposedly restricted to stylistic things and certain decorative elements in the fabric of the narration. Now, what special observations enjoy being referenced in the presented case? If we compare Matthew and Luke with their alleged template, then it strikes, that both "users" *have deviated* from the text of the final Mark template *in exactly the same manner*. Oftentimes, such shared deviations consist of Matthew and Luke omitting the same word or multiple equal words of the (final) Mark gospel. How come, that Luke carries over, where Matthew makes changes or omissions? (After all, they have supposedly not known each other!) The affair becomes especially mysterious by the fact, that the things in common not merely refer to greater factual changes (additions, omissions, re-arrangements), but extend to stylistic fine points (correspondence in individual vocabulary, changes to the same word). How about the popular explanation: this correspondence is coincidental [i.e. by chance]? There are indeed critics who with playful ease clear the path of the difficulties with the little word 'chance'. This time again however, chance behaves so peculiarly, steps into action so frequently, that thoughtful researchers can simply no longer believe in its cooperation in this matter. And behold: a reasonable way out is offering itself: *the primeval Mark!*

According to the primeval-Mark hypothesis, these many shared changes, omissions etc. are explained simply by the assumption, that Matthew and Luke have had the same pre-form (a primeval Mark) before them, and have [word for word] copied where the text was worded exactly the way the two synoptists show it.

Theoretically, that makes sense. After all, if some decorating and explanatory elements of the narration (the way the final Mark gospel has them) have *not yet been present*,

in the primeval form, then they could not have been copied by Matthew and Luke. Therefore, it makes no wonder, that they correspond in such omissions. So, everything seems to thus be in order. For a long time however, some critics have found more than one hair in *this* soup. The first hair crosses our path, when we contemplate, exactly *what* has supposedly *not yet* stood in the primeval Mark? Or, more to the point: what the (initially already mentioned) "editor", who has completed the pre-form to the today present Mark gospel, has supposedly *added to the primeval Mark*? Thus, with one blow, this anonymous finaliser of the Mark gospel now enters the scene; and for the time being, we must concern ourselves more with him than with Matthew and Luke.

What was still missing from the primeval Mark? What would thus the "finaliser" have still added later (after Matthew and Luke had copied from the primeval form)? Actually, nothing at all essential was missing from the primeval Mark, we are reassured. Alone, just certain decorative additions which, by their fresh colours, gave the description a more lively and vivid appearance, had not yet been there. In line with this, the "final" Mark gospel had been created by an editor tackling the dry primeval Mark, and painting on it the "lively colours of description", and being active as a fictionalising Beautification Councillor, as it were. By bestowing this telling title upon the editor, we are touching on a sore point of the primeval-Mark hypothesis. The idea of a primevally christian author, who wants to "beautify" a sanctioned gospel – because that is of course what the primeval Mark must have been, since it has even been copied by Matthew and Luke completely and allegedly word for word! – by all sorts of literary ingredients and decorations, presently arouses the psychological dissonance so well-known to us. Along comes a primeval Christian, who possesses exactly as much respect for a sanctioned gospel as his fellow Christians, and "improves" a community script in a fashion, in which one would clip into shape the work of a pupil. In real life, they would have energetically rejected such beautification work; which by the way earlier, the

editor must also have said to himself. Nonetheless, we now want to still just assume, that the "finaliser" had really mustered up the courage to newly design the sanctioned Mark gospel, and as a result, another difficulty arises. The big mystery, as *J Schmid* emphasises, lies simply in the fact, that the editor "*has contented himself with this* [namely, his stylistically-colouring-in beautification work; K.], *and has not done more*."¹³⁸ The reader thinks: why then should the editor have done more? This becomes clear, when we consider, that the edition of the primeval Mark must have occurred *very late*, since of course, when Matthew and Luke have allegedly used it, the beautification work had not yet been done. But even if the re-design had taken place earlier (and Matthew and Luke had only not yet managed to procure a copy of the beautified primeval Mark), then the mystery remains, why the "finaliser" had contented himself with the marginal ingredients. After all, we know from the stock of the remaining synoptical gospels, that still very many "genuine" traditional goods in terms of Jesus' words and deeds went from mouth to mouth that had not yet found a place in the primeval Mark. More than anything, many most significant sayings of the redeemer were missing. And of course, in the meantime, the melodramatic community legend had created and circulated a stately heap of Jesus tales! All this was missing from the primeval Mark! The editor would have earned himself a real merit, had he completed the all too short primeval Mark by at least the missing important Lord's sayings (such as the Lord's prayer). However, that such thoughts never occurred to him, that he has e.g. ignored Jesus' missing childhood stories, remains completely unintelligible, had it been his intention to "improve" the flaw-ridden primeval form. The author also arouses head-shaking by giving it his best to, in the true sense of the word – *deteriorate* the primeval form! Namely, from a comparison of certain linguistic peculiarities, it would have to be concluded, that the editor had tried various times to deliberately deteriorate the relatively good Greek of the primeval Mark. This is now, where the hypothesis begins to become laughable [my very thought over the last 250 or so pages...].

The primeval-Mark-hypothesis wants to force upon us a primevally christian gospel author who, by his peculiar "beautification procedure" on a sanctioned community script, reveals a state of mind and soul incompatible with the primevally christian basic disposition. If the "finaliser" vanishes into thin air again however, then the rigid primeval-Mark hypothesis, too, which is simply incapable of living without that ghost, can no longer be supported. We can also conclude vice versa here: with the theory becoming indefensible, the editor disappears into nothingness again.

There is now yet more striking proof, that the primeval-Mark hypothesis has a priori failed. As is well-known, it is by and large based, as is the two-sources theory, upon the *assumption*, that Matthew and Luke had *not* known and used each other.^{XLIX} Had the one evangelist known the other however, then of course e.g. the correspondence of the two in certain omissions would not at all be surprising, the hypothesis of a primeval form of the Mark gospel would thus have become meaningless. The proof that between Matthew and Luke indeed an acquaintance existed, will still be delivered by us, only not now, but in the place where it is needed most urgently, namely with the critical examination of the synoptical main source Q.

2. *The hypothesis of the fluid basic script*

*"With justification, the primeval-Mark hypothesis finds only little attention anymore with the nowadays state of the synoptical researchers."*¹³⁹ Currently, the hypothesis of a fluid, i.e. an under development existing, synoptical basic and foundation script (G) enjoys a greater popularity. This basic script, or so demands the most important prerequisite, must have

XLIX What am I missing? Have not all the gospel writers personally followed the 'master' for 1-3 years and whatnot? How on Earth can they not have known each other, each being one of the 'original' disciples? Or have they 'lost sight' of each other, and, as the co-instigators of this allegedly rather 'big' thing, not heard of each other in the process somehow at some time, what with all the 'churches' "immediately" springing up like mushrooms all over the place? Despite the post being somewhat slower back then, they *must* have still known at least *of* each other, even as fictional characters.

changed its appearance several times over the years, which occurred by it being "edited" a number of times. According to the level of development (editing), the different versions of the basic script are denoted G1, G2, G3. Already with the first mention of the synoptical basic script (in the opening chapter), we have highlighted as particular and novel with this thesis, that not perhaps only Matthew and Luke, but also the author of the Mark gospel have supposedly utilised this basic script as a source. They imagine this like so: during the composition of their gospels, Mark has used G1, Matthew G2 and Luke G3. [This is just getting worse all the time.] If the basic script is thus by no means identical with the final Mark gospel, then we would be permitted to rightfully say, that Mark "*in its blueprint mirrors the design of G the most faithful*".¹⁴⁰ We see that ultimately, G almost turns out to be a primeval Mark again, whose rigidness has very soon again transformed into a fluid movement however.

We now place the basic-script-hypothesis under the critical lighting. We can willingly admit, that this hypothesis is capable of explaining some mysteries of the synopsis (regarding the utilisation procedure) better than the (rigid) primeval-Mark-hypothesis. It will not require many words however, to make the reader realise, that this ship, too, has a fundamental leak. Since of course G, although it is not identical with the final Mark gospel, but, as we have heard, it is almost identical with the primeval Mark, the news does not come unexpected, that G would have to incur its leak on the same cliff as the mentioned primeval Mark. The cliff upon which both hypothesis' perish, is the presumed existence of the "editor". And we have to put up with not only one, but three editors this time, namely G1, G2 and G3. In the following investigations, our attention is preferentially focused on these editors.

Added to this first series of editors, it goes without saying, comes now the *second* series, i.e. this one is composed of the three synoptical evangelists Mark, Matthew and Luke. After all, Mark has supposedly already found and processed G1 to the canonical gospel, and

Matthew and Luke have done the same with G2 and G3. The reader needs in no way be confused over the multitude of editors; because with our critique of the basic-script hypothesis, it is basically not at all so much about this or that individual editor, but about *the phenomenon of the primevally christian editor as such*. Or, more accurately: we have to take note of the mental disposition which a primeval Christian airs in their function as alleged "editor" of sanctioned community script. The result is, that our critique of the basic-script-hypothesis must follow the same path as previously during the assessment of the special primeval-Mark hypothesis. We must again profess *editor psychology*. It is fully sufficient however, that such work – just with the primeval-Mark hypothesis – has already been done. Once the impossibility of the existence and work of primevally christian editors – here, 'editing' seen as the arbitrary modification of sanctioned gospel script – has clearly been proven, then this psychological impossibility proof automatically extends to *all* alleged cases that are demanded by the various hypothesis.

The question, whether a basic script under development could be viewed as one of the main sources of the synoptists, is answered in the negative by the above discourse. The reason for the negative answer lay rooted in the nature of the basic script: it has supposedly been a "fluid", i.e. a by multiple editors arbitrarily changed community script. A priori, the momentum of the editing renders the verdict over the existence of such synoptical basic script negative. If we wanted to deny G the aspect of becoming and developing in order to get rid of the editors, then G would tighten to the primeval Mark. However, since even the primeval-Mark hypothesis demands at least *the* editor who has re-designed the primeval form to the final Mark gospel – Mr Councillor of Beautification – not the least would have been gained in a positive sense by a tightening of the fluid basic script. The basic-script hypothesis invariably collapses.

However, so as not to keep any noteworthy objections from the reader, we want to still relate the following on the subject of user and editor psychology:

Critical theology cannot even operate without assuming users and editors who have arbitrarily changed sanctioned community script, if they want to solve the synoptical problem. The majority of the researchers have accepted the offensive, tough "fact" of the arbitrary treatment of the gospel scripts. There are still critics however, whom the surfaced high-handed source treatment by the evangelists and miscellaneous editors causes heavy concerns. With primevally christian authors, they actually find such careless handling of recognised deeds and words of Jesus not in order; a sign, that these researchers have contemplated a little more thoroughly than their colleagues. The psychological dissonance known to us has thus really risen to their consciousness. They have attempted to suspend the dissonance, to explain it away. Some attempts of that kind shall now be discussed here.

The English researcher *Cadbury* has contemplated just how to picture the source utilisation with the evangelists (editors). The purpose of his contemplation was to discover a utilisation procedure that allows a peaceful union *with the primevally christian basic disposition of piety* towards sanctioned and written-down gospels. He assumes the procedure of the antique profane historians, and comments; "*In his source utilisation, even the Hellenistic author must not be pictured according to the image of a modern scholar, who works with excerpts, margin commentary and critical individual considerations. Much rather: he has read his source scripts, has memorised their content, and he then processes it freely, that is, ... dictating. All that results in the greatest liberty of source utilisation.* [Oh, ffs!]"¹⁴¹ According to *Cadbury*, this is exactly how the new-testamentarian writers, evangelists and miscellaneous chief workers have operated. With this, we finally know how it is possible, that primevally christian authors could so freely handle their (sanctioned) gospel templates with a clear conscience: because yes, they read their template, but then locked it

away, and quoted from memory! This made indeed for the greatest liberty of utilisation – and there was a clear conscience, too, because each author of course strives to only reproduce "correct things" from memory! The naivety of this explanation attempt is boundless. Picture a man who, despite having a book next to him on the table or on the shelf, principally does not open it, but quotes its contents from memory! Also, *one* thing gets very badly along with the just then lauded greatest conceivable liberty (to stay with the first three evangelists): the great many existing *parallels*, right down to the wording between the synoptists. As a result, *Schniewind* has of course dispatched this memory hypothesis with these words: "*Are we to picture some random artificial mix of word-for-word copying... and high-handed source utilisation? The questions answers itself in the negative.*"¹⁴²

The just named theologian *Schniewind* himself now offers a solution to the primevally christian utilisation mystery by referring back to the "form history", well-known to us from Book 2. It reads: "*Even in the oral tradition, the highpoints of the narration already had fixed forms, a fixed wording*"; but already, this opening statement is incorrect. After all, especially regarding the very most important ongoing from Jesus' life, there was a permanent lack of a fixed wording in the oral tradition. Let us think of the institution of the Lord's supper, the beatifications, the feeding of the 5000 (or 4000?! "*In the christian traditionalising*", *Schniewind* continues, "*was then a rigidity of the wording completely extant.*" However, we have to picture even this written traditionalising quite essentially as being "oral". "*As written documents, Q and G are initially read during the service, memorised in the catechumen lessons. The author of the relevant new script initially knows these source scripts from frequent listening, then probably from own reading, which we can well picture as a service lecture... and even this is initially to be pictured so, that in the different communities G and Q, different forms were in use during the service.*"¹⁴³

Transparent clarity is probably the last thing for which these statements can be praised. First

off: what is a written tradition that we have to essentially picture as being "oral"? Without a question, this is a very peculiar affair, only, it is not clear. Regarding the actual utilisation procedure, it seems that *Schniewind* wanted to say about this: in order to find the into the wording stretching correspondence of a user (perhaps of Matthew) with the source G intelligible, we are to presume, that the user has not perhaps read his template several times and then put it away – the way *Cadbury* was imagining it – but he has so often heard the template being read during the service, or better still: has read it out himself, so that he knew the content off by heart. When he then set out to write his gospel, he was in a position to freely and so exactly quote from memory, so that word-for-word correspondence occurred – besides certain cases and details, where memory has failed him. Those portions, where discrepancies with the text of the source appear, can be traced to memory failure. In this manner, correspondence and liberty in the utilisation procedure find a "quite natural" explanation, and the fatal momentum of arbitrariness is happily eliminated – says *Schniewind*.

Unfortunately, we cannot agree with him, not at all. His explanation is no tad better than that of *Cadbury*. The assumption, that a user had merely relied on their memory, and had *principally loathed* to take a look at their written source (which potentially lay next to them) during their work, remains absurd. Themselves, these comical authors have not even afterwards compared what they had penned down from memory with the wording of the source, and made corrections where necessary – if we want to take *Schniewind*'s hypothesis seriously (which would of course never occur to us). And what is more: *all* evangelists have supposedly been such wondrous odd fish!

Schniewind's last sentence deserves a particular observation: "*Initially, this is to be pictured so, that with the different communities, G and Q were in use during the service in different forms.*" The hypothesis of the *fluid* basic script turns up again. The manner in which

our theologian bypasses the affair, makes clear, that the most important thing about it has escaped him. In this, things do not stand any better with the other researchers: they only see and study the utilisation procedure of the canonical evangelists, and forget over it, that there is another series of "editors" who want to be noted. These are e.g. G1, G2 and G3, i.e. those anonymous phantoms, to whom we allegedly owe the different forms of the synoptical basic script. It is not on to simply overlook these "editors" of G. These fog-like predecessors of the synoptists must have already committed all those crimes, of which they would so much like to clear their successors. Even the first editors of the basic script must already have more or less *strongly arbitrarily* re-designed their sanctioned source (the primeval form of G as the primeval gospel)! With these first editors, we cannot simply overlook and silently excuse an editing or utilisation procedure that is reprimanded with the canonical evangelists.

Schniewind is to blame for such oversight by quite carelessly accounting for the "different forms" of G (and Q) without recognising a new problem, or much rather, the old problem in a new edition and shape, in the alleged "development" of the basic script.

We have to regard *Cadbury's* and *Schniewind's* attempt at explaining away the as unbearable perceived psychological discrepancy between the primeval christian authors (reverence – arbitrariness) as failed. However, since this dissonance *can be explained in no way*, and since such contradictory mental disposition with the first Christians (also in their function as gospel authors) would have been *impossible* for sufficiently discussed reasons: so are the previously discussed source hypothesis', one and all, doomed to fail a priori. All sub-hypothesis' of the two-sources theory that we have met so far are suffering from having to work with the psychological discrepancy as a "fact"; however, something impossible can never be a factor in a hypothesis.

We are now in a position to speak the verdict on the robustness of the first main column of the two-sources theory. This column is given and erected by the claim, that *either*

the Mark gospel in its final form, *or* a rigid primeval Mark, *or* a fluid basic script were to be considered one of the two synoptical sources. All three suggestions have been examined by us. Since as the problem's essentials, we had recognised the primevally christian authors' psychology, the examination extended in each case to the peculiarity of the utilisation procedure. The obvious impossibility of the established procedure now determines our verdict so: the one supporting column of the two-source theory must, because internally rotten through and through, be dismissed as useless for the solution of the synoptical problem.

IV. A synoptical double-mill

One synoptical columns lies on the ground in pieces. Will the second column withstand the critical stress test? As we already know, the second column of the two-sources theory is the so-called *speech or logies source* Q. What observations have caused the researchers to assume the one-time existence of such speech source as secured?

All synoptical phenomena have been discovered *by comparisons*. Thus, the comparison studies of the gospels of Matthew and Luke then also lead to the fact, that these two synoptists have a mass of speech material (Jesus' saying) *in common*, which is strikingly *missing completely* from Mark. How is this shared existence of this (with Mark missing) speech material in the writings of Matthew and Luke explained? That with this so simple sounding question a difficult problem is stepping before us, is presently back in our consciousness, when we remember what strange relations prevail in the shared speech portions. It has of course already been pointed out in the opening chapter, that the great

synoptical mystery fact repeats itself in this mass of logies on the small scale: on the one hand, there is *correspondence*, on the other, we meet (regarding both the form as well as the content) significant *differences*.

Two from the philological handwriting practice known paths to solving the logies problem now offered themselves to the new-testamentarian literature critics, wherein it was primarily about making the formation of the parallels intelligible. First option: the one of the two evangelists has found the speech material in the written or oral tradition, and has incorporated it into his work. The other has then met the gospel of his predecessor, and copied the speech portions from it. So, here it is assumed, that the second evangelist had *known and used* the first one (acquaintance hypothesis). Second option: independently of each other, both Matthew and Luke have copied a *shared template* (Q) (independence hypothesis). Without a question, this second assumption also quite well explains the formation of the parallels.

The supporters of the two-sources theory have decided upon the second option, i.e. they have proclaimed the speech source Q as the second main column of their theory. The core of this Q hypothesis lies in the assumption, that the one synoptist had not known and used the other, i.e. that they have independently of each other written out the shared logies source Q. With the occurrence or non-occurrence of this assumption stands or falls the second synoptical main column Q. One more time: if it turns out, that Matthew had known and written out Luke (or vice versa), then Q has lost all justification for existence.

If the representatives of the two-sources theory most decidedly deny, that an acquaintance between the synoptists exists, then it may be presumed, that they are capable of producing valid reasons for their claim. Indeed, a whole series of piercing reasons can be listed. *Feine-Behm* for example highlights the following points: "*That Luke should have*

*drawn his speech material immediately from Matthew, or vice versa, Matthew should have drawn from Luke, is impossible. If the long sermon on the mount of Matthew had been available to him, just how would it have occurred to Luke to break this whole [thing] apart, to use a piece of it for his short sermon on the mount, but else, to spread the narrative over various chapters of his gospel? ... Vice versa, if he had read the entire parable chapter Luke 15, what could have moved Matthew to only carry over the parable of the lost sheep, but not the parables of the lost coin and the lost son?"*¹⁴⁴ The reader makes the acquaintance of uncommonly important comparison observations here. For example: the all-known sermon on the mount as a complete entity is found only in Matthew. As opposed to that, in Luke, we find this great moral sermon torn to little pieces like from arbitrary hand, and spread across many chapters like masses of rubble. What are we to think of this phenomenon? If Luke had known and used Matthew's gospel, then we would have to assume boundless arbitrariness and impiety. After all, he would have managed to judge and pluck apart the by Matthew as true handed down most important Jesus sermon like a random profane piece of speech! Even "critical" theologians do not attribute such arbitrariness and disrespect to primevally christian authors. Even a profane writer would hardly so senselessly treat even an insipid source. If Luke had known Matthew, and if he had even been willing to incorporate the sermon on the mount into his gospel at all, then he would have by all means carried over the in the communities well-known (and sanctioned!) sermon on the mount in its "historically given" entirety. Result: Luke has not known Matthew.

It is worth staying a little longer with the wondrous fact, that the in Matthew in a closed framework handed down sermon on the mount is accommodated in Luke in wide-spread fragments. Particularly the reader who approaches the synoptical problem as a novice may want to just contemplate this phenomenon. If they, together with the majority of the critics, hold the view, that Luke could not have possibly known Matthew, and bungle the by

the latter handed down great speech of Jesus, then they have to be prepared to make the riddle – how it is possible, that the sermon on the mount is so chopped up in various places in Luke? – intelligible in another way. After all the relevant discourse, they will hardly still seriously accept arbitrariness by Luke as an "explanation", especially when they still hear the following: with Luke, some sayings of the sermon on the mount are completely suppressed! Why, individual parts of Matthew's sermon on the mount have experienced far-reaching factual changes! There now, the researchers, inasmuch as they are supporters of the two-sources theory, offer to us the seemingly only possible way out: both Matthew and Luke, independently of each other, have copied the same source (namely Q). [Is there an echo in here? This all sounds painfully familiar.] Is the reader satisfied with this patent solution? Of course, the discussed case of the sermon on the mount leads them into the heart of synoptical practice, and virtually demands to be judged. Could Matthew have found the speech as a unit, and could Luke have found it chopped up in – *the same* source Q? Regarding the source Q, we simply must – so the critics tell us – accept a second precondition. We must assume, that Q had existed *in two versions very different from each other*. [*rolleyes*] So, much like the basic script G, Q was also busy "becoming". Matthew has copied the one version of Q (Q1), Luke has used the other version (Q2). In his source, Matthew found the sermon on the mount as a unit, but Luke found the great speech chopped up in his specimen. Thus, Luke is cleared of the charge of having applied unheard-of arbitrariness with recognised Lord's sayings. The theological critics breathe freely again: after all, they have succeeded – or so they think – in "satisfactorily" explaining an uncomfortable mystery fact with the support from the "fluid" source Q.

Unfortunately, our researchers have yet again painfully overrated their own abilities with an explanation, and the attentive reader has certainly already seen through the superficiality of this explanation attempt. In truth of course, the riddle as such is not yet

explained at all. It has merely been *pushed back* a little. The critics' acumen was only enough to mechanically relocate the difficulty from point a to point b. Later authors (Matthew and Luke) may have been cleared, but not only does the difficulty fully remain, but it is also directly placed on other shoulders, and carefreely taken for granted. Because the scapegoat, who is to blame for the chopping up of the sermon on the mount, has now become the "editor" Q2. Or are we doing the Anonymous Q2 injustice as well? Is he perhaps not at all the guilty party, either, after all? No, the critics reassure us, Q2 has not torn apart the great speech, either. The affair is much rather so explained "after all", that the "*community legend*" had been at work in this. Q2 had simply written down a different community tradition on Jesus' sermon on the mount than Q1 had. At last now, the critical conscience of the theologians has found peace; because in their view, the case is clear, and everything is in the best of order. Naturally, to us, who are more serious about our critique, this repeated shifting (into the mystical darkness of the community legend) means no solution to the problem. If we tear off the community legend's mystical mask, then community members become visible; this means that some random primeval Christians must have done, what with other primeval Christians (namely gospel writers and editors) is considered impossible (namely changing all-known and sanctioned speeches and deeds of Jesus in the most arbitrary way). If we exclude arbitrariness however, then the tradition's split into two mutually contradicting parts, in a way that even the most important and best-known facts of Jesus' life are implicated, can have only one cause: epidemic memory weakness of the first Christians. Since this cause is not a natural one (about which the reader has already found insight in Book 2), the whole phenomenon simply remains inexplicable by natural means. From which follows: we are dealing with an artificially generated phenomenon.

From the darkness of the legend, we now return again to the evangelists Matthew and Luke. The question still stands: has the one synoptist known the other? That Luke could not

have known and used Matthew, has been clarified above. However, we must also consider the reversed case: whether perhaps Matthew could have used Luke's gospel as an immediate source? (After all, there is no agreement on whether Matthew or Luke has written first.) With this new formulation of the question as well, the psychological difficulties instantly heap up to the old height. Namely now, we have to attribute (instead of to Luke) to Matthew the high-handed treatment of the sanctioned tradition, because now, he would have subsequently arbitrarily welded together the "originally" separately handed down words of Jesus (the way the Luke gospel shows it in "historical" fashion) to a make-believe sermon on the mount. And he would, on his account, still have changed the factual content of some words in this arbitrariness procedure. Naturally, it is not on to declare such arbitrariness procedure conceivable and possible in this case. It is thus confirmed, that there can be no mention of an acquaintance between Matthew and Luke.

Of further observations speaking *against* an acquaintance, only the following shall be named: the great contradictions between Matthew and Luke in Jesus' childhood stories. Regardless of whether we set the case, that Matthew had known Luke, or vice versa, Luke had known Matthew – one of them must have high-handedly changed sanctioned "facts". On this point, the critic *W Bussmann* reckons: "*We are permitted to ask, why Luke has still dared write a gospel in the first place, because Matthew had already been available, and possessed such great value to him. Perhaps only for... the sake of... the deviating prehistory. Here, it has to be assumed, that Luke has not known the prehistory, i.e. the childhood stories by Matthew, because else, he could then not have contradicted it so strongly.*"¹⁴⁵ So, since the researchers themselves find such arbitrariness of an evangelist not believable, they seek to find relief by having the authors each use originals, in which already deviating traditions were kept. Or they escape into the community legend.

Overlooking what has been said so far, we must admit, that even the few presented reasons for the assumption, that Luke had *not* known Matthew (or vice versa), have a penetrating effect. However, by turning to consider the acquaintance question dispatched in a negative sense, we are presently taught better. And we are somewhat surprised to hear of observations that again flatly knock over the just established result. What? There should really be counter-arguments with an equally penetrating effect? We want to see, how things are standing with this. Of the researchers pleading *for* an acquaintance between Matthew and Luke, we first name *W Larfeld*. Already his general consideration wants to be well-noted: "*Considering the great interest, which Luke, after the prologue, took in all (up to then existing) gospel scripts, it would be inconceivable, that a script of the importance of the Matthew gospel... could have remained unknown to him.*"¹⁴⁶ Vice versa, even if Luke had written first, we could rightfully say, that it is (perhaps not impossible, but) most highly unlikely, that then the later writing Matthew should not have gotten to know the gospel of his predecessor shortly after its creation. Naturally however, the weight of evidence of these considerations is not sufficient to completely answer the acquaintance question in a positive sense; more weighty reasons are necessary for this. And there really is no lack of penetrating arguments. After all, between Matthew and Luke, there exists a whole series of parallels of *linguistic* nature, that is, in those portions of their writings that they both share with the Mark gospel. *J Schmid* has particularly occupied himself with the linguistic-stylistic comparison of especially these portions. It can also only be appreciated, that *Schmid* is not referencing some random hypothetical "pre-level" of Mark, but the factually existing, namely the Mark gospel in its presented form.

It is most interesting now, that *Schmid*, although quite energetically denying an acquaintance between Matthew and Luke, and attempting to strengthen this *negative* opinion with ever new reasons, is nonetheless involuntarily turning into a witness for the *positive*

answer to the question. He shows by many examples of a linguistic nature, how Luke and Matthew have gone different paths in treating the Aramaic words of Mark, which thus betrays no acquaintance and dependence of each other.¹⁴⁷ It also does not point to acquaintance, when Matthew prefers the direct speech, but Luke the indirect speech in the reproduction of the Mark portions. Matthew and Luke may sometimes jointly omit numbers named with Mark, but: "*In other cases, sometimes only Matthew, sometimes only Luke, carries over the exact information of Mark. The overall result is again clear proof, that they are independent of each other.*"¹⁴⁸ So far now, everything speaks against an acquaintance. Suddenly however, this so far unique diagnosis gets confused. Observations of a linguistic-stylistic nature are forcing themselves, which refer to the opposite direction for the solution to the problem. These are (next to other phenomena) particularly the by us once before discussed *joint omissions* of Matthew and Luke in Mark's text. As is well-known, some researchers easily explain these omissions by the assumption of a primeval Mark, or a basic script, respectively. However, since all primeval-Mark and basic-script hypothesis' have to be rejected for primevally christian-psychological reasons, we now have to therefore search for other reasons for the peculiar parallels of such omissions. *Schmid* first lists the following explanation: the same tendency, namely striving for a briefer description (of the Mark text) on both sides, has effected shared omissions. "*That in many cases, the same elements fell victim to these shared tendencies, lies in their nature. They are simply more or less dispensable.*"¹⁴⁹ *Schmid*'s last two sentences testify to a certain insecurity, and by that alone, betray the dubiousness of the explanation attempt. Nobody will deny, that in some cases, striving for brevity makes the correspondence in the omissions appear conceivable. However, not merely a few now, but a great number of cases of joint omissions are to be clarified. And in this case, it is naturally inadvisable to justify this phenomenon with the "general tendency" for brevity; because the essentials – the many *shared* omissions – still remain unclarified yet.

So, we must look around for a better explanation. Even *Schmid* himself has yet another solution at the ready.

This other solution is the same one that has to step in every time a researcher is at their wit's end with their critical art. Then, the helper's helper "chance" is called for aid. "*At least a great number of the deviations from the Mark text, in which Matthew corresponds with Luke*", *Schmid* thus believes to be able to show "*as [occurring] purely by chance*". If we know, that *Schmid* only talks of "chance" from embarrassment, only because even with the best of intentions, he was unable to produce a reasonable explanation for "*at least a great number*" of cases, we can clearly recognise the crisis into which the acquaintance problem has entered. The turnaround from a negative to a positive answer to the question announces itself audibly enough. We can perceive this with each of the following statements. With all his might, our critic is struggling against the opinion, that there were an acquaintance between the synoptists, and protests: "*So far [with other comparing observations; K.], no indications for this [the acquaintance] have been found...*" So, according to *Schmid*, even in the peculiar cases of the joint omissions and changes, we must not view any indications for an acquaintance! Since no other reasonable explanation can be procured, we simply *must* believe in chance. However, even *Schmid* is very, very heavily struggling with this hardship. Lowly, he admits: "*Nonetheless, the parallels are somewhat stunning, and the assumption of bare chance is not quite convincing.*"¹⁵⁰ However, he then picks himself up, and states with emphasis: "*It is a methodical principle that tolerates no opposition: if 99% of the facts speak for the one assumption with imperative force – here, Luke's independence from Matthew – then the few remaining cases must not be assessed in the opposite sense.*"¹⁵¹ Unfortunately however, even this allegedly sovereign principle must put up with opposition, even strong opposition. Primarily, it does not even apply to our situation for the fact, that certainly more, many more than 1% of the cases quite clearly speak for an acquaintance (even accounting

some to "chance"). After all, in truth, Matthew and Luke, in remarkable changes as well as in peculiar omissions of the Mark text, *uncannily often* correspond. Facing such cases, dull "tendency" and blind "chance" no longer explain anything. Now, if we do not want to think of, and believe in, a mystical case of pre-stabilised thought harmony between Matthew and Luke, then only the quite reasonable conclusion remains: the one synoptist must have known and used the other. Assuming however, merely 1% of the cases were speaking for acquaintance (because no other reasonable cause for the peculiar parallels could be dug up), then in practice, with the existence of this minimal percentage, *Schmid's* principle has been pierced and rendered invalid. For even if only one single case were to be interpreted in the positive sense (because simply no other explanation could be produced), then with this (this one case), it is proven, that the one evangelists has known the other and copied from him. For the positive proof however, the state of affairs is much more favourable. Not only one case of the observations, but indeed a whole series of cases demands as a reasonable explanation the acknowledgement of the acquaintance between Matthew and Luke. With this now, flawless, firmly founded proof has been delivered in the positive sense as well.

On the building of the two-sources theory, the evidence that Matthew has known and used Luke (or Luke has known and used Matthew) has the effect of an earthquake. The second column of the theory cannot avoid the disaster, and it collapses as well now. Namely by establishing the existing acquaintance between the two synoptists, the shared speech source Q drops out as a superfluous and meaningless hypothesis. What can be leisurely rendered conceivable by mutual acquaintance, needs no explanation by the hypothesis of an allegedly shared source. By so arguing, we are notified by the outraged representatives of the negative opinion, that we had completely forgotten the *counter-arguments*; that it is not on to simply cast to the four winds counter-arguments of penetrating power of proof, especially since they are by far in the majority. With this now, the researchers are indeed completely

right. The negative counter-arguments demand the same acknowledgement as the reasons of a positive nature. So, we are prepared to also accept as proven, that Matthew had indeed not known and copied Luke (or vice versa). – We are now unwittingly in the double-mill, in that situation that had also caused the critic *Schmid* discomfort. *After all, something paradoxical is being claimed.* It is claimed that the two evangelists had certainly known each other, and that they had equally certainly not known each other. However, this is of course flat nonsense! Surely, something like that does not exist in real life! Quite right, dear reader: *in real life (of primeval Christianity)*, the "fact" that one author *had simultaneously known and not known another* (had simultaneously used and not used their script), would have been flat impossible. What has not been possible in the life of the primeval Christians, is now very well possible in the sphere of a great falsification (fictionalisation) action. Or, in plain terms: we are not dealing with a natural, objective fact, but with an artificially generated "paper-made" phenomenon. In medieval learned forgery headquarters, such procedure amongst invented "evangelists" is offhand possible. The twisted synoptical problem of the mess of acquaintance and non-acquaintance (of correspondence and contradiction) finds an unexpectedly simple solution through the realisation, that the synoptical mysteries owe their artificial existence to ice-cold calculation of the forgery collective. The two-sources theory is thus comprehensively refuted.

V. The indefensibility of the layers hypothesis'

In the previous chapter, we have experienced that even the best of all synoptical theories, the seemingly really robustly built two-sources theory, is not capable of withstanding a serious-critical stress test. So, do we now have to repentantly return to one of the in the opening

chapter mentioned *other* solution attempts? Many theologians have yet learned from the damage, and now, they shy away from the specifically *literary*-critical approach to the gospels like children who have caught burns with fire. We have to therefore attempt to approach the solution by a different path, said for example the "form historians" to themselves. That the form-historical path also leads into the swamp miles away from the solution (into the swamp of the community legend), has been clarified by other investigations in Book 2. The fundamental error committed by the form historians, as is well-known, consists of the fatal confusion of the primevally christian tradition, which stands under the imperative of "historical" factors, with freely operating folklore.

Neither literary critics, nor form historians can do without the *community legend* as an iron, pseudo-critical ration. A certain difference exists inasmuch as we could say, that with the form historians, the spectre of the community legend is haunting in the foreground and in broad daylight, while with the literary critics, it is in the background and by night. The first kind of critics take the "tradition" for a starting point of the investigation, the second category on the other hand, only escapes to the "legend", when the water of the critique has flooded all remaining islands. Regarding *one* point however, both parties are in agreement: in the oral tradition as well as in the tradition fixed in writing, different *layers* must be assumed. And the element that has chiefly caused this layer formation, simply is, according to both parties' opinion, none other than the – community legend.

Since *D F Strauss*, for the first time, has evoked the spectre of the community legend by myth-ification of many constituents of the evangelical "history", there is a warning cry constantly sounding from the crowd of the new-testamentarian scientists: *watch the layers!* They can, must and want no longer scare away the spectre itself, once it has been found, how well it can be utilised as a *deus ex machina* for the solution of twisted tradition problems. Primarily, they cannot at all do without the legend anymore, because they have gotten used to

blaming the mysterious workings of that myth-spectre for elements of Jesus' life and teachings odious to "modern" Christians and theologians.

In the last hundred years, nothing has triggered such applause amongst the evangelical critics as has the discovery, that with the hypothesis of the layer formation, a "historical core" of the gospel reports could allegedly be saved. It was perceived as the liberation from heavy pressure, when the way out opened up to view the "mythological" portions of the gospels as *later precipitated layer masses*, which only need to carefully be removed again, in order to reveal the "historical primeval stone". We understand the great satisfaction *M Maurenbrecher* has felt when writing down the following sentences: *"Amongst the deniers of the historicity of the human being Jesus, never did anybody have an eye for the fact that in the tradition of Jesus, various layers are placed on top of each other... In the later stages of the tradition, the legend-related interest has proven to be at work... Just from this, it follows however, that this oldest stage itself could not have also been drawn from the legend-like fiction of the community. It is merely to be understood as a relatively true memory of events that had factually happened."*¹⁵² ["Latest" = "oldest"? What a waffle...] We can very clearly recognise the layer separators' intention to thrust forward through the mystical hull up to the "historical" Jesus, the way he has "really" lived and taught. And so it was of course layer separators, too, who were the pathfinders to the modern, "liberal" Jesus. However, especially regarding the main question, just what exactly in the gospels is mythical veiling, and what is historical core, never has an agreement been reached. From the orthodox theologian, to whom the biblical reports mean to onehundred percent historical core content, to the liberal one, who recognises only one percent "historical core" under ninety-nine percent of myth masses, probably all proportions of the tradition have been proclaimed to be myth, or historical core, respectively.

So, the importance of our question, whether there are layers in the gospels, makes sense. By the way, we have already met the problem of layers once before, that is, with the discourse of the primeval-Mark hypothesis. Allegedly, an "editor" (Councillor of Beautification) has deposited over the primeval Mark a layer of picturesque additions. In practice, the work of a critical layer separator chiefly consists of establishing, whether a gospel perhaps originated from a uniform cast (in which uniformity of the tendency plays a part), or whether it is based upon a "pre-form" that had been extended and completed by one or multiple "editors", or whether a gospel proves to be a hotchpotch script, as more or less loosely joined compilation of different types of templates (sources), so that there can be no mention of uniformity of tendency. Without a question, there is no scientific significance to arbitrarily assuming random, and randomly many, pre-forms and sources. We must at least possess some indications in the relevant gospels themselves, in order to be entitled to talk of layers (pointing to sources and pre-forms) of a gospel. There were, and still are today, many critics who are convinced having found the required objective indications in all four gospels. For decades, they have zealously studied the literary architecture of the gospels, and believe having made numerous observations, which unobjectionably prove the existence of layers (sources). Let us examine whether those researchers are right with their claim. We first turn our attention to the Mark gospel, and raise the question: *are there layers in the Mark gospel?*

With remarkable unanimity, this question is answered affirmatively by the representatives of the critical (liberal) theology. After all, the supporters of the two-sources theory assume at least two layers in the Mark gospel, regardless of whether they accept a primeval Mark or a synoptical basic script as the allegedly first layer. In the following, I want to relate to the reader the interesting acquaintance with some layer separators, as far as their work extends to the Mark gospel.

1. The layer hypothesis by *E Wendling*

In a work published in 1908¹⁵³, *Wendling* – not a theologian by the way, but a philologist – distinguishes *three* successively deposited layers of the canonical Mark gospel. According to *Wendling*, the *first* (earliest) layer (Mark 1) stems from a primeval Christian whom he calls the "elder narrator". Curious, we ask *Wendling* how he has tracked down this narrator then? It can of course not be easy, we think to ourselves, to detect and distinguish three "narrators" in the Mark gospel. Just exactly how is it done? One has to only seek, and always seek again. He who seeks will find (simply because they want to find something)! Now, when *Wendling* was so tenaciously seeking, did he not, in the Mark gospel, find certain portions that excel by a strikingly *clear and simple style*? Indeed! In *Wendling's* perception, too, such clear pieces could easily be separated from the overall mass. Behold: already, by simple means even, the "elder narrator" was discovered! Because all these pieces stem from a certain author – says *Wendling*. This discovered primevally christian author must be praised as a man of well-defined literary individuality. "*Basic attribute of the description is clear simplicity and striking brevity.*" The elder narrator offers a "*plain, unassuming art of narration*", and practices a "*simple style*".¹⁵⁴ It needs not concern us which portions *Wendling* attributes to this first author in detail; sufficient is the fact that an oldest layer is "really" found. Since we have not quite yet recovered from the astonishment, we refrain from any critique for the time being.

Wendling examined the Mark text anew, he sought and indeed: a second literary individual surfaced, the so-called dramatist. To the already existing fabric (stemming from the oldest narrator), this author has made all sorts of additions, but he has always designed them in such characteristic way, "*that they extend the original in dramatic fashion as prelude and afterpiece.*"¹⁵⁵ Vividness and a "fresh sense of nature" form this narrator's (Mark 2) most prominent presentation elements. He also skilfully manages to "*evoke suspense*".¹⁵⁶ He is not free from certain bad habits however. Mark 2 is for example lively interested in the attire of

the acting persons. Thus, his imagination is the origin of the pillow in the boat (in the tale of the calming of the storm) and the upholstery (in the room where the last supper took place). "Because of his fancy for motives of attire, Mark 2 has to also be considered the author of the note on the clothing raffle."¹⁵⁷ According to *Wendling*, another odd habit of this "dramatist" consists of *arbitrarily duplicating* some of the events reported by the first narrator.¹⁵⁸ It is indeed quite a peculiar evangelist whom *Wendling* is presenting to us here, and to whom we allegedly owe the second layer in Mark's gospel.

And how has *Wendling* found the *third* layer? Very easily and effortlessly: everything that does not stem from the first and second narrator, i.e. what is left over, forms the third and last layer. *Wendling* calls the third author, who was once again all over what has been written by his predecessors, the "editor", and identifies him with the canonical Mark-evangelist. With this editor, we now meet a rare stupid-clever human being who causes us never-ending amazement. Namely, he has seen one task of his "editing" in introducing *contradictions* to the excellent description available to him.¹⁵⁹ Unbelievable, but true – *Wendling* protests. After all, this editor has really been a little stupid; this is revealed by his *strong misunderstanding* of the template; he simply cannot "*place himself in the situation*".¹⁶⁰ The editor distorts the "true" image of Jesus as a clear, folkloristic speaker – we do not quite know whether from stupidity or from calculation.¹⁶¹ Linguistically, he proceeds carelessly and superficially.¹⁶² He re-cast the powerful original text (of his predecessors) into his own banal style.¹⁶³ He high-handedly tears apart "*the good old context*".¹⁶⁴ However, our editor is not perhaps only stupid; no, he is also clever, cunning and crafty! Namely according to *Wendling*, we must attribute to him also the smart theory of the to-be-kept-secret messiah. After all, we read in the finished Mark gospel, that during the first period of his public work, Jesus *forbids* to publically announce him as messiah. So, the editor has plucked this "*messiah secret*" from thin air. Unfortunately, the clever man immediately reverts to the state of stupidity, because he does

not manage to consequently carry out his own theory. "*That a speech prohibition is entirely useless, once the proclamation has in many cases already taken place, does not bother him.*"¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, the editor is the inventor of the mysterious parable theory, according to which Jesus has told "parables" whose meaning has only been understood by the disciples even after their explanation by the master. The *people* however – thus the clever editor fantasises – *is not meant to understand the parables*, and for that reason, Jesus speaks only in dark parables. So, this man thinks up quite a crafty theory. Yet again however, he proceeds inconsequently. "*How is it explained*", Wendling asks, "*that despite this theory, he retains the old attribute* [namely, that in his parables, Jesus speaks clearly and understandable; K.]? *Obviously, we must assume, that he has misunderstood the parables.*"¹⁶⁶ Yet again however, he is simultaneously so clever, that he is capable of *inventing Jesus sayings*, and to even express himself in the Paulinian linguistic style!¹⁶⁷

So, Wendling has made wondrous discoveries when he went out to seek layers in the Mark gospel. With his three-layer hypothesis however, he has already not found much support from the theological critics. And our verdict on the hypothesis comes out simply devastating. If we hear that for example to the "true" reports of a recognised and sanctioned gospel – after all, the work of the "elder narrator" would have been such a community script – Mark 2 additionally invents dramatic preludes and afterpieces, and arbitrarily duplicates certain all-known events from Jesus' life, then to us, a rejecting verdict is a done deal. For psychological reasons, which we have already sufficiently discussed, we must again eliminate the alleged primeval Christian Mark 2 from the pool of historical personalities. Finally, we need not waste many words on the stupid-clever "editor" (as the actual Mark evangelist); because a "primevally christian" individual who would manage to comprehensively botch a community script in terms of content with the aid of the community, has a claim for citizenship only in the world of thought phantoms. For that

reason, we also need not rack our brains as to how it was possible, that a concoction of the worst quality was welcomed by the fellow Christians with applause, and has been introduced to the communities as an authoritative script, while the sanctioned old script was "abdicated" and disappeared forever. So, since two of the by *Wendling* "discovered" editors vanish again into nothingness, still only one author remains, only the alleged evangelist Mark as author of the gospel named after him. *Wendling's* attempt at establishing layers in this gospel has comprehensively failed.

The true root cause (and the purpose) of the mentioned peculiar phenomena in the Mark gospel (and in the other gospels) are to be sought and found in a completely different direction than all past researchers had naturally assumed. Only in a later place, when the manufacturing recipes by which the gospels have been produced are revealed, the reader will be informed on the true origin and character of the problems touched here.

Only on the duplications, there are some things to be said a priori, and this is for the reason, that especially in this phenomenon, all critics see the best proof for the existence of layers (sources) of different origin. He who traces duplications back to the writing out of two different sources however, is operating with the unspoken assumption of the carelessness and stupidity of the gospel authors. After all, these people must then *have never noticed themselves*, that they had copied for example a saying of Jesus twice. And the psychologically remarkable thing is, that all three synoptists have not noticed their duplications. However, the most peculiar thing about this comes out in the fact, that the evangelist Mark not only did not know the "duplicate" of the wonderful feeding, but even explicitly *emphasised the two reports* to not be identical by *invented Jesus sayings*! And this explicit highlighting of the not-being-identical of two (equal!) events leads us to the solution of the duplicate mystery. The duplications have not perhaps "by accident" and "carelessness" entered and remained, but they have been *deliberately* installed as duplications. (Naturally,

not by "primeval Christians", but by the instigators of the medieval falsification action!) The duplication is (in the falsified secular "history" of the Middle Ages as well!) a popular tactical means of consciously varying a "fact". The new-testamentarian critics have also already long noticed (without being able to correctly interpret this observation however), that for example with duplications of pieces of speeches, those pieces, the second time around, "*return in a different context and in a slightly modified version*".¹⁶⁸ The duplicates are simply a sub-form of the deliberate contradiction, i.e. the deliberate modification of a fact out of dogmatic necessity.

2. R Thiel's hypothesis of the three Mark gospels

In the year 1938, *Thiel*, also not a theologian, asked himself anew, just exactly what conclusion is to be drawn from the earlier mentioned phenomena for the type of formation of the Mark gospel? Quite especially the *repetitions* in the Mark gospel made an impression on *Thiel*. "*If I can point out more than sixty striking repetitions (even three-fold), and amongst them, thirty cases, where literally in the same breath the same thing is said again with different words, then there is hardly any other explanation for this than that in the Mark gospel, different writings have merged together, that is, have unskilfully been merged, so that the constituents can still be distinguished.*"¹⁶⁹,^L If in this context, we hear that the very latest layer separator, *E Hirsch*, assumes only a sum total of three duplicated narrations in the entire Mark gospel, then *Thiel's* discovery of dozens of duplications causes us considerable amazement. How zealously must *Thiel* have yet searched, that he found really that many! Let us straight away have a look at some such "repetitions". (Well understood: this is supposedly the two-fold telling of the *same* event!) The report of the *baptism* (Mark 1,11) and the report of the *transfiguration* (Mark 9,7), according to *Thiel*, refer to one and the same event. On the

^L Since there are two endnotes missing from the running text (169 and 170), I am (safely) assuming this one to be 169. However, 171 is used twice, so the first '171' is probably meant to be 170.

one hand, the fact of the being identical of both events is, by the different details of the situations and the different design, not so readily, or not at all, recognisable for dopey eyes. The duplication expert Thiel, on the other hand, only needs to read that in both, apparently so different narrations, the same utterance – namely: "You are my beloved son" – appears, and to him, this is proof that the baptism and the transfiguration basically represent the same historical fact. Another *Thiel* case of being-identical is the following: the story of the unclean spirit in the synagogue to Capernaum (Mark 1,23) and the story of the epileptic boy (Mark 9,25), "historically" taken, are the same thing! And why? Because on both occasions, Jesus threatens a mute spirit. If we now shyly object, that in the one case, talk was of a possessed man, in the other of an epileptic boy in a totally different environment – *Thiel* replies to us that this means nothing; for the duplicate expert, simply the "the historical core", that Jesus had threatened a mute spirit, is the decisive momentum. Another example: as a "historical" event, the tales of the cleansing of a leper (Mark 1,45) and of the healing of the demon-possessed man of Gadarenes (Mark 5,20) are only duplicates of one and the same fact. Proof according to *Thiel*: on both occasions, a healed one proclaims the wonder deed happening to them!

We now come to some shining discoveries that our critic has successfully made when he was so fanatically in search. Not only twice, no, occasionally even *three times* has *the same* event been told in the Mark gospel! Like *Thiel*, we have to only have the special eye in order to recognise the identical basic event under the everytime differently designed cloak of the situation. So, let us hear: "*Consecutively* [Mark 14; K.], *there is mention of three meals. The first is the meal in Bethany, where a... woman anoints the redeemer... The second* [meal; K.] *brings the announcement of the betrayal. The third one is the actual Lord's supper.*"¹⁷⁰ Intuitively, there is no doubt for *Thiel* at all that here, it is the same "last" meal every time, namely the passover meal. Furthermore: even if in three different places (Mark

2,13/4,1/6,34), one prayer each of Jesus by the lake is told, it has to be assumed, according to *Thiel*, that we are dealing with one event appearing triplicated here. Or the following case: the evangelist has Jesus announce his imminent suffering three times to the disciples; although this is happening on different occasions and in different surroundings every time, the same event is again the basis, according to *Thiel*. It is also reported in the Mark gospel that Jesus, after his first entry into Jerusalem, returned to Bethany twice in the evening for the night, in order to return again to Jerusalem the next morning every time. This is "historically" incorrect, *Thiel* patronises us, because in truth, Jesus had only come to Jerusalem once, and went into the temple. So, here as well, we are dealing with a triplication of the same fact.

The reader will probably hardly lust for further duplications and triplications of *Thielian* discovery. In the meantime however, the question will have ever stronger forced upon them, just why *Thiel* was looking for duplicates and even triplicates with such passionate endeavour? Because he saw himself forced to find as many repetitions as possible, since only in this way, he would be in a position to substantiate his three-layer-hypothesis with the necessary "factual" observations.

Thiel summarises another big group of observations in the Mark gospel under the category "inconsistencies". This time, we must agree with the critic in almost all cases; because among those inconsistencies count those (already known to us) contradictions, how for example Jesus "publically" gives away the messiah secret that he had only just ordered the disciples to keep secret (Mark 8,30 ff.) Such contradictions as well as logical and linguistic improbabilities have long been established in the Mark gospel. *Thiel* has also quite rightly observed in the regard that he points out, that some portions appear joined together like patchwork.

From all these observations, *Thiel* has distilled for himself a hypothesis on the structure and origin of the Mark gospel that can certainly be praised for being most novel. The "repetitions", that is, the *three-fold repetitions*, were crucial for the construction of the thesis. For this, according to *Thiel*, there is "*hardly any other explanation than that in the Mark gospel, different layers have melted into each other*".¹⁷¹ And the fact of the three-fold repetitions proves a *three-fold* layering! But how are these three layers distinguished? It is not at all difficult to neatly separate them from each other, if we only know, like *Thiel* does, how to properly utilise the "inconsistencies". *Thiel* is extraordinarily versed in such art; and his greatest ability as layer separator has then turned out an amazing result, too: "*Three complete, stylistically flawless*" sub-gospels make an appearance in the Mark gospel. With this, the so far in darkness veiled origin of the Mark gospel is suddenly most brightly lit up.

According to *Thiel*, and in line with his discovery of the three sub-gospels, we have to imagine the formation history of the canonical main gospel as follows: the primevally christian author whom we call the (canonical) Mark evangelist, had come to possess three gospel scripts. These three sub-gospels, in terms of content, "apparently" strongly deviated from each other almost throughout, although they "basically" reported the same ongoings, only in different disguise. Unfortunately now, our "primevally christian" author was not blessed with such sharp mental eye, that he could have recognised the (three-fold differently) told events as being identical. In his simplicity, he considered everything fundamentally different events; he did not even recognise the two miracle feedings as duplicates, although especially these reports, since they correspond in almost all sentences, clearly enough present themselves as a "duplication". What a pity, so said the "primeval Christian" to himself, that these three "holy" scripts are circulating so isolated in the communities; would it not be a worthwhile and meritorious occupation to melt the three separates together into one big unit? Said, and done. The task was not quite so easy however.

Because our author did not perhaps want to copy the three sub-gospels successively, one after the other, but *shuffle* their overall mass *into each other*, so that something like a *uniform cast* would form – so *Thiel* patronises us. And really: the endeavour succeeded! By skilful shuffling manoeuvres, *one* new, big gospel was created, just that canonical Mark gospel. The fact that for the evangelist, because he was a pious "primeval Christian", "*the words of his three sources meant holy truth*", has effected that he copied his sources "*painfully conscientiously, without losing a single word*".¹⁷² Why, his conscientiousness and his fear from changing sanctioned community script was so great, that during the process of shuffling-into-each-other, he placed the individual pieces from the three basic scripts next to each other purely mechanically, rough and coarse, not unlike bricks of different origin, and without any mortar. For the author, it would have been an easy thing to eliminate the from such mechanical procedure resulting points of fraction by omission or addition of a few words (between two pieces), and to thus achieve a smooth transition, but he was, as mentioned, a "*deeply religious person*" to whom even the smallest addition already meant a violation of the wording of the sanctioned scripts. It comes across as peculiar of course, that the pious evangelist was not bothered in the slightest, what damage he was causing in a different direction; because now, especially by his mechanical sticking together of portions of different origin, the many "inconsistencies" (contradictions, mental leaps, improbabilities) were created! For the layer-seeker *Thiel* however, it is to be praised as great luck, that the author proceeded so mechanically-pedantically; because now, such "points of fraction" of the text "give away" to the layer separator *those* points in today's Mark gospel, where once two different layers have been shuffled into each other, or next to each other, respectively, i.e. where the one source stops and the other begins.

Thiel himself feels that with his shuffle-hypothesis, he is asking an awful lot of the reader, and he writes: "*I am also guessing, that some now begin shaking their heads over the*

evangelist Mark: is it possible then, that a compiler is so attached to the words of his source? That he rather forms meaningless sentences instead of leaving out only one single word?"^{172a} We have to accept the "fact" however, regardless of how strange it is, *Thiel* consoles us. Yet, to his detriment, he then feels pressured to accept some exceptions; and with this admission, he most involuntarily subverts the religious-psychological main reasoning of his hypothesis himself. After all, the separation of the layers is for *Thiel* only possible by the fact that he imagines, that the "inconsistencies" had formed via the mechanical shuffling-into-each-other of the various pieces, and that he has this procedure be conditional by the *fear* of the pious author to apply only the minutest change on the wording of the three sources. Now, such pious fear of the smallest change either exists, or it simply does not exist. If *Thiel* admits under compulsion, that the author has *yet modified* the text of his template a number of times, then that is the best proof, that the alleged fear simply did not exist. "*Minimal re-touching, small pedantries*": with such expressions, *Thiel* seeks to justify the situation that is so fatal for the psychological foundation of his thesis. On one occasion however, he must even "*charge*" the allegedly shy evangelist "*with a pretty voluminous addition, namely the comparison of the two feeding miracles*."¹⁷³ With this, the author has "*wanted nothing but order*", or so *Thiel* lively excuses this fatality, "*German order, in a manner of speaking*"! Will you have a look at this primeval Christian with the German sense of order! Nonetheless, "from pedantry", this man of order leaves, in soulful peace, the "inconsistencies" created by his mechanical shuffling method standing! Although it would have been an easy thing for him to also eliminate these many points of fraction that are heavily distorting the meaning, by slight "re-touching". However, he has not re-touched the inconsistencies, contradictions and mental leaps, i.e. he did not want to eliminate them; he has left them standing deliberately – but not from fear of the holiness of the wording of his sources (because a so frequently suspended fear is no real, no effective fear!). If with this,

"pious fear" as an explanation for the deliberate carrying over of meaning-distorting inconsistencies must be disqualified, then there is else no other sensible reason to be found for this peculiar behaviour. Stupidity or carelessness cannot be brought forward as explanatory reasons, since according to *Thiel*, it is established that the author had "indeed" a close eye on inconsistencies, because he occasionally re-touched, i.e. arbitrarily. By the way, *Thiel* himself does of course not trace back the formed contradictions and mental leaps to carelessness, but to the pious fear of the compiler. If this purported fear (by the fact of the "exceptions") proves to be factually not effective, i.e. non-existing, then *Thiel's* entire hypothesis structure collapses. The critical catastrophe becomes more momentous still, when we realise that the great majority of the alleged "repetitions" merely represent the arbitrariness produce of *Thiel's* duplicate-addiction.

Thiel also still believes to have found "direct proof" for the composition of the Mark gospel from different layers (sources) *by the style*: "*Namely by the fact that there are particularly vivid and particularly constructed stories told in it.*" Quite besides the fact however, that with this stylistic means of differentiation, at most two, but not three (as the hypothesis demands) layers could be extracted, the complete indefensibility of this stylistic separation method can easily be established especially by the by *Thiel* separated "sources" themselves. Let us just have an eye on the miracle tales in all three layers (the way *Thiel* has separately listed them at the end of his book): stylistically, they are all completely identically constructed and told (namely vividly and dramatically moved), by the alleged author of source A (e.g. the story of the possessed man of Gadarenes and Jairus' little daughter) as well as by the author of source B (man with the withered hand, blind man of Jericho), and equally also by the author C (the gout-broken man, the baptist's end). It thus turns out that in practice (of his separated sources), *Thiel* himself is unable to consequently utilise his stylistic separation method.

Thiel's attempt at proving layer formation in the Mark gospel has also not brought a positive result, although this critic, too, was partially supported by factual observations (inconsistencies). Naturally, the actual home of all difficulties has not even been guessed by either *Wendling* or *Thiel*. His [*Thiel's*] eye remains rigidly fixed on the canonical Mark evangelist, i.e. the alleged compiler who has supposedly slapped together the three sub-gospels, in craftsmen's manner, into the main gospel. He thus completely and utterly overlooks, that still *other problematic entities demand attention, namely the authors of the sub-gospels*. According to *Thiel*, all three authors are supposedly reporting "basically" the same "historical" facts – but *how* do they tell the relevant "same" basic event! If we assume that author A had written pure, bare truth, then the authors B and C must have seen it their task to dress the individual bare truths in all sorts of fairy-tale garments. We remember: by mystical fact transformation, the report of the baptism has turned into the tale of the transfiguration. Since a "historical" fact cannot transform itself, it must likely have always been this or that "author" (B or C, or B and C) who has had their hand (their imagination) in it. (With the three-fold repetitions, *B and C* must have been active as transformation artists.) Short and sweet: *Thiel* does not even notice what monstrosities he is committing "in the background" of his hypothesis' stage. Why, he is turning the by him discovered *sub-evangelists B and C into first rate fairy-tale fictionists!* With *Thiel's* hypothesis, too, the actual problem has thus subconsciously been shifted from point a to point b. If *Thiel* were to object that author B (and C) had not been fictionalising themselves, but only been faithfully writing down what they had drawn from the oral tradition, then that would merely mean a renewed shift of the problem into anonymity, i.e. an escape into the community legend. With such tactics of shifting, nothing would have been gained or explained; because we cannot get beyond the fact that some random "primeval Christians" must have heftily re-fictionalised the "historical" facts. However, that, and why, such horrible fiction epidemics would have been

impossible in the real world of primeval Christians, only needs mentioning, but no longer any lengthy discussion. We close these files by placing the cherry on top of *Thiel's* discoveries here: "*An interesting result: according to B, Jesus has not been arrested in Gethsemane, but already at the passover meal.*"¹⁷⁴ Truly, in "primeval Christianity", there was some horrendous fictionalising going on – assuming, *Thiel* were right with his novel hypothesis of the three Mark-sub-gospels, which has been proven to not be the case however.

At the end of this chapter, we take the opportunity to quickly have a look back at its beginning, where there was brief mention of the "messiah secret". As is well-known, Mark reports that Jesus, during the first period of his appearances, had *forbidden* to name him the messiah. Some theologists have racked their brains over this secretiveness, and guessed at a somehow deep meaning behind it. But the affair has quite a banal explanation: namely, this is simply a tactical manoeuvre, a means of composition, which the medieval gospel writer collective deemed advisable.

The reader remembers the difficult problem: for how long did Jesus' work in public last? What now?, the gospel fictionists asked themselves. If we present the affair as though Jesus had stepped forward with the public proclamation of his messiah dignity right at the beginning, then we will not get far with the whole Jesus story; because in the rough reality of the Jewish environment, a person who would arouse the people with such blasphemous claim, would not have remained a free person for a week. However, the master, with his disciples, must have been able to wander around in Galilaea (and partly in Judaea) unchallenged for roughly a year, in order to have enough time to proclaim the entirety of his teachings of the Empire of heaven, and to prove his messiahdom by numerous wonder deeds. In order to render such long duration of undisturbed missionary activity somewhat believable amongst the Jews, they invented the way out, to *temporarily* treat and keep Jesus' messiah

attribute as a *secret*; because in that case of course, the opponents would not find out about the blasphemous affair, and "naturally" leave the preaching rabbi unharmed for a while.

Time and again, it shows with what thorough contemplation the organisation of the medieval gospel authors had proceeded with the literary construction of the "historical" part of the Jesus story. In the last chapter, we will again come to discuss the messiah question, albeit in a different sense (chapter VIII).

VI. Figments of imagination as gospel writers

Layers are the result of a development. If we talk of layers (sources) in the gospels, then this is meant to indicate, that these layers have gone through a literary process of development, before they received the final form in which they are presented now. If it is really possible to establish layer formation (particularly in the Mark gospel), then theoretically, the possibility would thus be given to cleanse the allegedly "original", i.e. still unadulterated, Jesus image from the soiling layers of dirt of the "community legend" – famously the hotly pursued objective of all liberal-theological critique. Since Mark has the reputation of being the oldest gospel, it has of course always been the most prominent subject of the theological Mark-separation-art. We have already examined two of the layer hypothesis concerning the Mark gospel, and we had to reject them as obviously faulty speculations. In the middle of me writing this now, just in time, I am facing the, for the time being, very latest attempt of this kind. Loud and optimistically, the author of this latest work proclaims having ultimately solved the problem of the layer formation in an affirmative sense. We do therefore not want to hesitate critically dealing with his brand-spanking new hypothesis with the due attention.

3. *The formation of the Mark gospel according to the hypothesis of E Hirsch*

The new two-volume work of the theologist *E Hirsch* on the early history of the gospel¹⁷⁵ arouses our interest already for the fact, that the author rejects the form-historical view, which has recently become fashionable, and returns (like *Thiel* before him as well, by the way) "*to the strictly literary-critical methods of the classical German gospel research*". New-testamentarian literary critique is probably no longer popular with the nowadays theologist generation predominantly for the fact that over time, it had become ever clearer that for example regarding the synoptical question, it can only churn out contradictive results, and it has the effect of a corrosive on the "historical" basic mass of Jesus life, anyway. Now, *Hirsch* especially wants to show, that from the flowers of literary critique, an intelligent bee can also generate excellent "historical" honey. Nicely and neatly, *Hirsch* has moved the useless legendary layers of rubble out of the way, and revealed the granite primeval stone of the "history" of Jesus' life, now visible to all eyes. Since there is a danger, that someone not familiar with the synoptical matter is defenselessly smothered by the weight of *Hirsch's* erudition – the critic has treated his difficult subject with great zeal and a sharp mind down into all details – we must all the more thoroughly examine, in which critical manner *Hirsch* has achieved his "positive" result. We spread our assessment of the latest hypothesis over three chapters, and give the discourse of the presented chapter the title: *Figments of imagination as gospel writers*.

Hirsch has, as he mentions on one occasion, concerned himself with the literary-critical analysis of the Mark gospel for years, and nowhere does he mention, that he owes the inspiration to the guiding thought of his hypothesis to a third party. All the more striking does the similarity of his thesis' fundamentals to *Thiel's* speculation come across. The latter believes having established three sub-gospels in the Mark gospel, which have been mechanically shuffled into each other by an editor. To our surprise, we now hear from

Hirsch, that he has also "discovered" an editor, who has equally mechanically carried out a similar shuffling work. Only, one difference exists by the fact, that the editor with *Hirsch* "*plumbed together*" not three, but two sub-gospels (the likeness to the plumber stems from *Hirsch*¹⁷⁶). While furthermore, *Thiel*'s three sub-gospels are quite different in terms of content, the two template scripts of *Hirsch*'s hypothesis prove to be not fully independent; next to portions of a different nature, the two much rather share a voluminous stock of the narration fabric.

With the by *Hirsch* established two sub-gospels, we begin the examination of *Hirsch*'s hypothesis. *Hirsch* denotes the first of these layers Mark I, the second as Mark II. As always, so now, too, we focus our interest on the alleged *authors* of these scripts. What can *Hirsch* report to us about them?

Of the author Mark I, we hear that he narrates as an *eyewitness*, what he has experienced himself in dealing with Jesus. This "fact" is sufficient to alert our attention to the highest degree of readiness. When *Hirsch* had a close look at the literary qualities of this eyewitness, he encountered a joyous surprise: because Mark I revealed himself to be a virtual textbook example of a good, correct reporter. In the whole world – so *Hirsch* reassures us – there is and there was no human being better suited to be a biographer than just this Mark I. Hats off to such grandiose discovery! With and through Mark I, the ideal of a biographer has become a reality. This "primevally christian" author "*was no ponderer*", but offers "*plain, realistic reproduction of what he had experienced, without any frills*". "*Wonderful clarity and brevity and determination*" characterise his unique literary *modus operandi*. By this biographer ideal, "*nothing is extenuated, nothing transfigured*". So, from this eyewitness, we learn the bare, pure truth and the by nothing muddled factuality of Jesus' "historical" life. *Hirsch* has, as he emphasises more than once, not been able to establish "*falsification of the memories*" on any point with this narrator. Thus, Jesus has without a question found in Mark

I the ideal of an objectively referencing biographer. – Yet, how quite differently does the literary image look that *Hirsch* is sketching for us of the *author of the second sub-gospel*! However, for this author Mark II, it has to be pleaded in excuse, that he did not write down his experiences as an eyewitness, but that on the one hand, he has edited already existing originals, and on the other, that he was forced to draw from the oral tradition. Actually, Mark II is merely a compiler, not an original reporter. And which literary task did – according to *Hirsch* – this "primevally christian" author pose himself? During his time – he allegedly wrote in the sixties – there were already three different gospels, according to *Hirsch*. The reader has already just met one of them, the most precious piece: it is the objective masterpiece of Jesus' life by the "eyewitness" Mark I. The second piece – denoted by *Hirsch* as the "*source of twelve*" – is nowhere near as precious as Mark I; because it was created one generation later, and in *Hirsch's* opinion, it has proven to be so deeply interspersed with the community legend, that it is impossible to extract with certainty a "core of authenticity" here. (The third allegedly still existing sub-gospel is not yet of any interest to us in this context.) The author Mark II now – as so many "primevally christian" men – has supposedly said to himself: for the purpose of "historical" foundation of our "modern" cult, a good deed would be done by merging the two separately circulating community scripts (Mark I and source of twelve) into one unit. (According to *Hirsch*, our author has "actually" not merged two gospels, but merely "*newly designed the one old gospel valid in his community*", by modernising it, as it were, aided by another community script (source of twelve), i.e. he has made it serve the "cult" of the sixties (which unquestionably means nothing other than "merging" two sources).¹⁷⁷ Very soon, he put his plan into practice, too. It makes us prick our ears, when we hear from *Hirsch*, that Mark II did not view his merging work as a purely mechanical putting together, i.e. that he did not merely play the master plumber. Fear from the "holy" wording of the sanctioned gospels did *not* live in his "primevally christian" heart:

for just this reason, he did not have to deliver a craftsman-like work, but he could kneed and design the found narration fabric in line with his "artistic" insight. Naturally, with such psychological disposition of the author, christian concerns were out of place, and, as mentioned, did not exist in the first place, either. (For the time being, we want to simply forget that a "primeval christian" gospel writer with such state of mind is impossible.)

So, Mark II, the way *Hirsch* has discovered him, is an author who *masters* his *source*. If he deems it necessary, he directly abuses the wording, chops it up, and throws parts of it on the literary trash heap. What even should cause him to view and treat sanctioned gospels differently, more carefully and conservatively than any random profane script! We can study the brutal treatment on the eyewitness gospel of Mark I. How did Mark II proceed with this most precious, most well-known and most revered gospel of primeval Christianity? Frankly: he has "*gone over the report of the first narrator like with hedge clippers*".¹⁷⁸ In order to gain room for the pieces of his second template (source of twelve), he cut from the first template what he deemed "sub-standard" without hesitation! And these are not perhaps merely single words or small sentences, but even some voluminous portions of the narration. He erases for example (allegedly out of cultish interest) the parables of the growing seed and the mustard seed, in order to insert a different one, namely that of the sower. To his taste (so, probably no dogmatic-cultish interest was thus in effect after all!), the last parable was simply more beautiful and suitable, although as a product of the "legend", it has not been a "genuine" saying of Jesus.¹⁷⁹ *Hirsch* has not quite worked out whether Mark II was a skilful or unskilled compiler. On one occasion, it is said about him: "*He destroys the scenic situation*".¹⁸⁰ Or: "*With an impossible connection, he repeats a description once more, and by doing so, he achieves a bumpy illustration*".¹⁸¹ Anyway, he shows "*nowhere a clear view of the historically consecutive order of Jesus' activity*".¹⁸² Next to this however, we hear that he manages a well-considered, good structure by meaningful erasures. It is a literary bad habit of

Mark II to occasionally create stylistic variations by expressing a thing with different words than those shown in his sources. Arbitrarily (yet hardly to serve the "modern" cult of his time!), he turns *one* unclean spirit into a "legion"! ¹⁸³ He does not like most of the in the eyewitness gospel told story of the feeding of the 4000; he therefore energetically re-fictionalises it! (Although *Hirsch* reckons that not actually Mark II, but probably the community legend had heftily "re-shaped" here.) It is primarily the "historical" number details in this story of the feeding that the author does not like. So, he just turns the 4000 into 5000. Under his pen, the 7 loaves of bread, a few fish and the 7 baskets (in Mark I) turn into 5 loaves of bread, 2 fish and 12 baskets! By and large, *Hirsch* himself must declare the compiler to be a "*pro-active re-designer*", or clearer: a fictionist. So, there can "*actually*" be no big talk of a "*service to the cult*"; because: "*For the great majority of his changes, Mark II does certainly not have any tradition to support him.*" ¹⁸⁴

As our brief overview confirms, *Hirsch* has indeed succeeded in "discovering" in Mark I and Mark II two "primevally christian" authors, of whom each in their way represents a sharply defined literary individuality. Do they not appear palpably vivid, these two men? As much as we are tempted to immediately critically target the two authors, we want to contain ourselves, and first still duly introduce the man onto whom *Hirsch* has bestowed the title 'Plumber'.

After Mark II had finished his "re-forming" compilation work, as the desired result of his efforts, the new subjective hotchpotch gospel has been placed next to the objective primeval gospel of the eyewitness. So, in the community of Mark II, there were now two gospels "valid"! Because remarkably, the sanctioned first gospel Mark I was by no means immediately supplanted by the new competing work, despite the just occurred degradation and cavil by Mark II – *Hirsch* reassures us. It had endured all abuse, and was now "deemed" sanctioned community literature! Presumably, it was now "deemed" a pleasant and edifying

pastime to for example compare the number details in the stories of the feeding of the two scripts. Is it possible then, that the concoction of the "fictionist" Mark II even found acceptance?, we were asking in amazement. Why, certainly, *Hirsch* retorts, because for a long time already, the sentimental auntie "community legend" had ploughed the spiritual soil for such "modern" literary works.

So, *both* gospels Mark I and Mark II existed and were "deemed valid" *equivalent next to each other* now. (*Hirsch* does not doubt this "fact" for one moment. The critic *Hirsch* quite overlooks that here, an even new, very fatal problem is surfacing, which rightfully wants to be noticed.) The fact of the two gospels existing next to each other has aroused the contemplation of a third "primeval Christian" whom *Hirsch* calls R (editor) [original: **Redaktor**]. The result of his contemplation was the decision to *unite* these two community scripts, and in that manner, create a main gospel. We are uncommonly interested in how R was proceeding in this merging procedure; because according to *Hirsch*, it has turned out that R is at least a mental twin of *Thiel's* editor, if not even identical with him. Namely, his shuffling procedure was carried out exactly as mechanically as in the mentioned earlier case. In order to possibly not loose a single word from the two sources, R sets up his biographical machinery like a mechanic. No wonder, that under his hands, "*scenic confusion*" is created, just those "inconsistencies" known to us from *Thiel's* hypothesis. As a twin brother of *Thiel's* editor, R also feels a great fear of omitting a word from his sources, so that he rather accepts "*monstrosities in sentence structure*" than omitting minutiae.¹⁸⁵ Nor does it bother him at all to calmly carry over crass contradictions resulting from the mechanical shuffling-into-each-other.¹⁸⁶ The similarity of R to *Thiel's* editor is bafflingly increased by the fact that with R as well, the "fear" of the wording of the originals is *so frequently suspended*, that there can simply be no mention at all of "fear" as a christian-psychological disposition. When he feels like it, the "shy" man quite carefreely tinkers around with the "holy" wording of the "valid"

gospels! In doing so, this "plumber" proves to be not at all as dumb as he pretends to be. After all, he manages, by a meaningful addition, to give a thing "*a gravity as fundamental as possible*".¹⁸⁷ Else as well, he (proactively) enriches the text of the sources with longer sentences that sometimes indicate a great gift of acumen. Mostly however, his additions consist of "*late-limping, pedantic additions*" that appear to be completely useless, so that we ask in amazement, why R has not rather applied his "improvements" in places where they were desperately needed because of an "inconsistency".

We must now at last sit in critical judgement over the three by *Hirsch* "discovered" primevally christian gospel authors. For now, we want to remember that the existence of these three figures has come about by a process of speculation by the literary critic *Hirsch*.

As *Hirsch* informs us, R has supposedly carried out his merging work in the seventies, i.e. not long after the alleged creation of Mark II. Since the community legend was "famously" working non-stop and at maximum output in those years, *Hirsch* finds it quite in order and fashionable, when R as gospel author carefreely references the legend. According to *Hirsch*, we owe to R, in chapter 6 of the Mark gospel, the in dogmatic regard so significant change of the words from "*son of Joseph*" to "*son of Mary*". It is thus proven that R is not in the slightest concerned over newly designing the wording of his sources. How cordially little he is troubled by scruples in this regard, is starkly highlighted by *Hirsch's* discovery, that this "primeval Christian" has even mustered up the frivolous courage of putting into his resurrected master's mouth sayings that he had *invented himself*.¹⁸⁸ And the same man now, according to *Hirsch*, has supposedly at the same time been such an exceedingly pious gospel writer, that he could simply not bring his christian self to erasing even the smallest and most insignificant little word of his sources! With this, the verdict over R has already been spoken. It is this: the wild hotchpotch psychology that has become apparent, reveals the alleged primeval Christian to be a thought phantom. Not in the medieval forgery headquarters has

this homunculus been created however, but R is a fantasy product of the modern layer searcher *Hirsch*. By the way, what had to be presented against the historical existence of *Thiel*'s editor, now equally strikes R's "historical" life force devastatingly in all details; because both "personalities" are identical in their most inner nature (un-nature).

But now: the "eyewitness" Mark I! *Hirsch* barely finds the words to duly praise the excellence of this evangelist. We remember that this author, as Jesus' company, describes what he had experienced himself, that is, with an unrivalled objectivity. Brief, clear, without any extenuation, he reports the naked truth! "*This is a human being living quite by the view of reality, whose natural form of expression is the descriptive word, the word, making eyes and ears realise, the in factuality plain and brief word.*"¹⁸⁹ [What a load...] *Hirsch* still has a very special surprise ready for us: namely, he is able to tell us which "historical" person is hiding behind the Anonymous Mark I. And who is this author of "the most strict self-discipline" to whom the reality that he had to describe is "holy"? It is none other than – Peter! Even gullible theologians will be enormously baffled over such revelation. What? Peter, the recognised *visionary*, the hothead and daredevil is supposedly simultaneously a man of the "*most strict self-discipline*", of "*iron factuality*", with a "*sensual sharpness of observation*"?¹⁹⁰ A novel psychological mix!

A further surprise, this time also for the most recent theologians: so far, down from all lecterns of the new-testamentarian-historical theology (in particular, still in the last decades by the form historians), it was taught that the news of Jesus (throughout one or even multiple decades) had been preserved and disseminated *only orally*; at least for the first decade after Jesus' death, there is no thought of a written, complete gospel. *Hirsch* thoroughly tidies up this view, and proclaims: "*One year after Jesus' death, this narration (namely the gospel of Mark I-Peter) was already there.*"¹⁹¹ What luck that Peter has, *immediately* after the master's passing, set out to write down his adventures, or much rather, dictate them to a scribe, since

according to *Hirsch*, he was presumably unable to write. With the immediate writing down of his memories, Peter has done the literary critic *Hirsch* a big favour. Why? Had the apostle waited around a decade with the writing-down, then even this reality giant would have become a victim of the in the meantime forming and raging community legend. However, even the slightest suspicion of murkiness must be rejected by *Hirsch*, since else, no "historically" founded duty would exist to view Peter's gospel as unconditionally real, faithful to the truth and authentic. But the layer separator *Hirsch's* hot endeavour aims especially at uncovering the absolutely unadulterated historical mother soil of Jesus' life. Thus, Peter *must* at any rate have *immediately* begun writing down his experiences! And so it comes, that *Hirsch* has indeed discovered that Peter had supposedly authored his gospel really in the first year after Jesus' death!

Peter, visionary and man of iron factuality in one person, as a gospel author, deserves our attention for another while still. We want *Hirsch* to still tell us something interesting on certain limits of Peter's mind and his literary talent. Even if we take the Mark gospel as a whole (i.e. Mark I and Mark II together), it is undeniable that by content, it only offers a fairly small overview on the events of Jesus' life. (We recognise this by the overflowing stock of the other gospels.) Now, since the Peter gospel (Mark I) is *still* shorter than the complete gospel, it becomes clear that Peter has not recorded all deeds and words of Jesus by a long way. Why did he not do it? His limitation would be understandable, if the one or the other apostle had also decided to write down the enormous things experienced with the master, and in doing so, had primarily considered the by Peter ignored power deeds and sayings of Jesus. Now, none of the co-disciples has authored a second gospel in the first years after Jesus' death however. Had indeed so early existed a desire to write down the experiences, then there could be no doubt that the disciples would have jointly discussed how to handle the writing down of their adventures. Had it then turned out that Peter had omitted anything *important* in

his gospel, then the zeal of the remaining disciples would have most willingly helped the memory of their co-disciple along. Why has Peter not related many important things nonetheless?

The explanation that we receive from *Hirsch* on this point is somewhat baffling. *Hirsch* establishes a mysterious "limit" in the mental nature of the author Peter. *"The strength of the narrator lies in grasping the situation, and in grasping the short and meaningful reply. The nature of Jesus' meeting with the people is sharply defined; his mental confrontation with the environment becomes clear only as far as the reply can gather it. Here is the limit of his report. In his speech, Jesus must have been more than comes out with him [Peter]."*¹⁹²

Translated from the language of the learned, this means: Peter was well able to tell us what Jesus *did*, but he was unable to relate to us what Jesus *spoke*. In a different place, *Hirsch* expresses himself a little clearer on Peter's deficiency: *"The narration gives no image of what must have been the most peculiar and most fascinating about Jesus, his speeches and teachings. Of that which he... said, we learn little or nothing. Here is the insurmountable barrier of Peter's individuality: to grasp this, he has mentally simply not been sufficiently lively."*¹⁹³ [He talks like a Jew who wants to sell a lame horse.] Why, this is yet a tall order that *Hirsch* is asking of us, and that he wants to talk us into. The same author who was wonderfully capable of giving vivid descriptions of the events, was (simultaneously unable, because of some strange mental "barrier", to write down Jesus' sayings (even the most important and most well-known ones)! If we only knew just what exactly *Hirsch* wants to be understood by the alleged fact of this "barrier", or whether he even has a clear understanding of it himself. Is that meant to say that in general, Peter had an excellent memory, but for Jesus' saying, of all things, he possessed a terribly bad capacity for remembering? If this "barrier" is meant to be such a one-sided catastrophically bad memory, then the "facts" loudly and well audibly prove this explanation to be a lie: after all, within the framework of his tales,

Mark I has related enough sayings from Jesus' mouth! So, Peter has been able to equally formidably preserve in his memory both the relevant situations as well as the words (speech) belonging to them. Especially for essential speeches of Jesus as well, he has shown an excellent memory capacity. Thus, the by *Hirsch* proclaimed limit can not be rendered conceivable by the assumption of an alleged memory barrier. How else are we to explain the alleged fact of the barrier however?

Assuming that this barrier has its origin in Peter's will: does this assumption produce an understanding? Should Peter have perhaps *intended* to not write down more of Jesus' sayings? Then, there would have to be a valid reason for this giving-over. Namely, in the alleged Peter gospel, especially the for the community most important things are not related: the orders, admonitions, commands of Christ with regard to the ethical lifestyle of the Christians. In real life, the primeval Christians would have been no less thirsting to hear, what the resurrected one had said on this or that burning question overall. Why did Peter not write this down, too? Why did he *want to report nothing* on this? The only sufficient reason could have been: because other disciples, in their gospels, had particularly considered this (by Peter omitted) side of the proclamation. This only possible way out however, *Hirsch* has thoroughly obstructed for himself by being forced to state: "*For a certain while, Mark I must have remained the only gospel* ." ¹⁹⁴ So, that means that when Peter wrote, there was not simultaneously a second gospel being created whose peculiarity (as a speech script) could have caused the first apostle to possibly disregard Jesus' sayings in his work. As has already been emphasised, in real life, Peter would not have been a writer at the green [baize] table and no hermit; he would have, it goes without saying, constantly been and kept in touch with his in Jerusalem gathered companions (co-apostles) when he recorded his (and their) Jesus adventures. Although no other co-apostle (as he knew) wanted to catch up with the important speeches of the master in an additional script – because according to *Hirsch*, this second

particular speech gospel was created only considerably later, around the time when Peter had left Jerusalem – Peter should supposedly have *deliberately refrained from* leaving the most important sayings of Jesus to the community, he should have deliberately not satisfied the urgent desire of the newly converted? This is primevally-christian-psychologically impossible. No matter from which side we might tackle the problem of the barrier of Peter, it always turns out that it cannot be solved by natural means. The factually existing problem is fooling us, i.e. it is yet again an artificially generated phenomenon. As already earlier R, so now the strangely limited objectivity giant Mark I-Peter, too, as a "historical" building element, drops out of the texture of *Hirsch's* hypothesis structure. Like R, Mark I evaporates into a thought phantom as well.

To settle accounts with Mark II as an allegedly historical personality does not cause much more work. As a "Christian of legends" who dared assault the "valid" gospel of Peter like with hedge clippers, he is taking – for sufficiently discussed reasons – his own historical life. The opportunity is favourable however, to finally also dispatch an idiom of excuse that is customarily uttered by all theologians, when the partially pleasant, but partially also quite prickly problem of the "community legend" demands an explanation for its mysterious existence. The idiom is this: *with primevally christian authors such as Mark II, the infliction with the legend is not perhaps surprising, but quite understandable, because this is the second christian generation here!* It is simply – or so the terrible phenomenon is cleared – the psychology of the legend-addicted *second* generation with which we are dealing. This explanation by all means deserves being looked at more closely. If it is emphasised that the rape of the bare truth by the legend is to be addressed as a phenomenon peculiar to the second (and following) generation, then it is silently admitted that naturally, the first generation was still opposed to such truth-destroying thinking and fictionalising. To just use the language of *Hirsch's* hypothesis – with the "iron factuality" of the objectivity ghost Peter and under the

control of the remaining co-apostles, how even could the *first* Christians have gotten the idea, and how could it have been possible for them to play the poets of legends? In the face of the equally embittered and suspicious opponents, Jesus' disciples could think of recruiting faith companions only by the proclamation of the pure truth. (We hypothetically set the case here, that the Jewish authorities had allowed the disciples such advertisement, which would not have happened in real life however, for reasons listed in Book 2.)

Even *Hirsch* must admit that regarding the "historicity" of Jesus' life circumstances, at least the first generation had been raised to strict factuality under the harsh imperative of the situation. However now, in thinking and feeling, the *second* generation of these Christians could *not* be imagined to be separated from the first generation *by an abyss*. With the second generation, there was no beginning of an absolutely new start in the mental-spiritual disposition. This is to say: the second generation grew up under the determining influence of the first. In real life, the "iron factuality" of the Jesus stories would have been infused in the following generation with mother's milk, and designed to become a never-to-be-lost spiritual possession. How should (could) there especially these in the matter-of-factness of the parents' truth raised Christians have fallen for the thought of suddenly inventing legends about Jesus against their better and sanctioned knowledge? *One* should have had to start with this – and (in real life) they would have been immediately called to reason by eyewitnesses (of whom there would have been some still alive) and by a hint at the sanctioned fact-gospel of Peter. Now, that with the beginning of the second generation "indeed" a [biblical] flood of legends broke out over the christian community – remains a completely inconceivable phenomenon, i.e. it owes its true origin to artificial creation. The outbreak of the legend is by some researchers put into a causal connection to Christianity's conversion from the Palestinian-Jewish sphere to the Hellenistic-Asia Minorian world. The indefensibility of this thesis will

be clarified by us in a later place, in connection with the supposed formation of the early-clerical dogma.

It is thus not on to declare the friend of legends and poet of legends Mark II, as a representative of the second generation, eligible for existence; he, too, must again disappear from the historical stage onto whose boards *Hirsch* has magicked him with his hypothesis reflector. So then, as a result of our investigation so far, it has been firmly established: Mark I, Mark II and R are impossible for primevally christian-psychological reasons; all three of them turn out to be speculative phantoms of the literary critic *Hirsch*. In the following second part, the same result is gained and confirmed from an entirely different side.

VII. A textbook example of how to construct layers

All efforts of the literary critic *Hirsch* serve the purpose of proving, that the Mark gospel is composed of layers (narration sources) shuffled into each other and placed on top of each other. Then all we have to do is remove the masses of mythical legend layers in order to bring to light a historical core of the Jesus tradition. It cannot be denied that *Hirsch* is really striving to proceed scientifically, i.e. methodically. The only question is whether the utilised method is flawless, whether it is any good. In order to answer this question better, we want to demonstrate by some textbook examples how *Hirsch* proceeds when constructing layers.

For the reader, a full understanding of the following operations will only be possible, if they do not neglect to check the discussed places in Mark in one of the numerous existing modern translations of the New Testament. (For our purposes, a study of the Greek text can

be omitted.) It is best to take the by *Hirsch* himself offered German translation in the 1st volume of his work, since in it, the entire fabric is lucidly sorted by the found layers.

In order to gain clarity on the usefulness and value of the by *Hirsch* handled method of layer separation, it is not required to follow the course of his literary-critical analysis step-by-step; as the quality of wine can already be recognised by a few samples, so can the quality of the method, too.

So, in the 1st chapter, our analyst bumped into verse 21b with which the up to verse 27 reaching scene takes off, how in the synagogue to Capernaum, Jesus heals a man possessed by the unclean spirit. *Hirsch*, as a passionate layer separator, was predominantly interested in the *connection* of this scene with the ones before and after. Immediately before, it is reported (verse 16-20), how Jesus gains as his first disciples men who have been busy fishing, and how he enters Capernaum together with them. Directly after the synagogue story, we learn, that the master, with the first disciples, goes from the synagogue into the house of Simon and Andrew; there he first heals Simon's mother-in-law, and then, after sundown, still heals many sick people rushing in from the town. If we consecutively read the whole thing (i.e. all three portions) attentively, and if we do not necessarily expect a modern, flowing style of narration from a "primeval christian" gospel author, then we may well find the report here and there presented a little awkward and bumpy, but nonetheless in good, well understandable succession. Certainly, the connection (of the three scenes with each other) could have been woven more "elegantly"; but the main thing yet remains, that a logical connection even exists, and that is the case here. If we want to judge Mark as a writer, we must never lose sight of the fact, that this "primeval Christian" has written down his entire gospel in the narration style of the simple man of the people. Mark is no finely educated parlor narrator. Characteristic for the folkloristic cumbersomeness of the author is the fact that *almost every sentence is introduced by "and"*. Simply unmistakably, "the man of the

street" reports on the events in Jesus' life in the Mark gospel. If we now, as is proper, consider with monotonous uniformity repeated sentence beginnings (connections) of Mark such as "then", "now", "immediately" as well as similar cases of principal awkwardness to be peculiarities of the nature of the simple author, then we will have no cause to take particular offence with the (intended) folkloristic bumpiness of the connections and context. However, *Hirsch* is simply looking for layers, and he thus frees himself from any necessary courtesy for the "simple" narrator. We are only surprised that the critic does not simply establish as many "points of fracture" as there are for example clumsy sentence beginnings with "and".

Yet *Hirsch* found what he was looking for. During repeated reading, he had discovered it: "*The story of the cleansing of the demonic one (Chap. 1,21-28)... cracks up the context of the narration.*"¹⁹⁵ According to *Hirsch*, this is supposed to say: this demon story (in the synagogue to Capernaum) does not stem from the first author (Mark I), but has subsequently been right clumsily wedged into the original text by a second hand (Mark II). According to *Hirsch*, this wedged-in scene has cracked up the original context. The following bumpy bits "force" *Hirsch* to this assumption. Firstly: on the occasion of the calling of the disciples, it is reported immediately *before* the contested synagogue scene, that the four of them had been fishing, or mending their nets, respectively. Thus, the day of the calling could *not possibly* have been a *Sabbath*, since such work was not permitted to be carried out on that day. Now, if in verse 21, immediately following the scene of the calling, it says: "*then they went into Capernaum*, and immediately on the Sabbath *he entered the synagogue...*", then of course, the transition is designed clumsily in the respect, that we could perhaps think, that the prior calling had also occurred on *the same* Sabbath day. Can one and the same narrator express himself so leisurely, bumpy and ambiguous?, *Hirsch* is asking. We reply: certainly! After all, to connect so awkwardly is simply this evangelist's way. *Hirsch* replies however: no! There must have been a second hand inserting and spoiling something here. But even

Hirsch lets go of this first trump card, if he knows that by doing so, he gets a second, allegedly better one into his hands. So, together with many other exegeses, he is potentially happy to accept, that the contested section could also be interpreted as though the first narrator himself, with his awkward "*and immediately on the Sabbath*", had actually wanted to say "*and immediately on the next Sabbath*".

Hirsch can, or so he reckons, reference a second point that shall prove the subsequent wedging-in of the synagogue scene. That is, he now turns his eye to the section immediately following the synagogue scene. "*But if it says directly on the next Sabbath, then entering Capernaum is suspended in mid-air; only [in] verse 29, Jesus comes into the house that had served him as quarters in Capernaum. One only narrates as in verse 21 on entering Capernaum, if one wants to report something directly following.*"^{196,LI} *Hirsch* has carried out the following contemplation here: as we learn from verse 29, at least 2 of the 4 called disciples stem from Capernaum, because the "*house of Simon and Andrew*" (in that town) is explicitly mentioned. So, nothing is more understandable than that after entering the town, Jesus goes straight away to the house of the named ones together with the just called ones, and takes up quarter there. Does it not sound improbable, if it is reported that Jesus had not perhaps gone to the disciples' house, but initially, "*on the next Sabbath*", to the synagogue, taught and healed there, and only afterwards, coming from the synagogue, entered the disciples' abode? "One" does not narrate so clumsily, our layer seeker shouts. We would have to (potentially) agree with him, if – if only the Mark evangelist were principally a skilled author. And just this presupposition does not apply. Mark is indeed a principally clumsy folklore narrator! Besides, it is still very much the question, whether Mark had really reported

LI What a terrible language treatment in the German original this guy is committing, and not just on this occasion: no quotation marks for "*directly on the next Sabbath*", generally terrible sentence structure, pretentious wording, like a teenage wannabe-poet. What's that? I'm no better, you say? You're probably right, but I don't pretend to be a literature expert/critic, of all things, like this putz does. Heck, I'm not even a 'real' translator.

so clumsily in this case. Why then should the affair not really have been like that? Must it be really insisted upon that Jesus, together with the disciples, had visited Simon's house immediately on entering the town? In "reality", it could quite well have been the case, as we read, that at first, namely the master with his (by the "calling" religiously aroused and thrown off their usual track) company had focused on more important matters than viewing the home of his disciples. Must not the religious zealot Jesus much rather have been lured to the synagogue first? We must therefore reject *Hirsch's* opinion, that the entrance into Capernaum is suspended in mid-air, as dictated by stylistic over-sensitivity. Thus, the second trump card played by *Hirsch* is also without effect. The well-known finding remains, that the primitive folkloristic narrator Mark has often designed his transitions and context a little bumpy and unclear.

That on occasion, *Hirsch*, remarkably, is not at all troubled by having to patiently accept quite big improbabilities even with his clear-as-day "first" author (Mark I-Peter) as well, he proves with his benevolent assessment of the portion of the narration immediately preceding the synagogue scene (calling the first disciples), of all things. As is well-known, Jesus walks along the lake and first notices Simon and Andrew doing their fishing business. Without any prior explanation, the stranger (Jesus) prompts the two to follow him! He had determined them to be fishers of men. And the two drop everything, and follow this stranger. Is an any more improbable situation conceivable? After all, we must well note that the narrator reports nothing of a previous acquaintance of the two fishermen with Jesus. The affair is much rather presented as though previously, the two had not heard of the rabbi Jesus – nonetheless, they follow the stranger's brief, most wondrous prompt as if it were the most natural thing to do. How improbable! How bumpy in logic! Everything is suspended in mid-air here. This time however, our analyst is not troubled in the slightest. This time, according to *Hirsch*, such improbability can safely be booked to the "first" narrator's account. (Because

unlike the synagogue story, this story of the calling does not have a nasty dogmatic hitch.) For that reason, we must call it pure arbitrariness, when directly after, certain other (alleged) improbabilities (or better: unclarities) are charged to an ad hoc invented second narrator; only because a cracking-up of the context *shall* be established.

Now, just how amazed is *Hirsch* only going to be when we show him, that the *context of the narration that he considers to be cracked up by the synagogue story, to the contrary, is yet only simply being conclusively established by this story*. In verses 32 and 33, it is reported that on the evening of the Sabbath, the citizens of Capernaum brought all their sick into or before Simon's house, respectively, and Jesus has healed many of them. However, *how* did all the people in town *know* of the healing and miracle powers of the rabbi from Nazareth? *Hirsch* will reply: the shortly before occurring healing of Simon's mother-in-law had made the rounds, hence the rush. This reply can by no means be taken for so granted however. Firstly, the healing of fever simply does not constitute such an extraordinary miracle, so that a whole town is spontaneously stirred by it. Secondly, the evangelist does not indicate with a single word, that this in the house occurring healing had immediately, or even still on the same day, become publically known. Right away, it is striking that the fever healing is not at all presented as something glorious or remarkable; it simply peters out under the reporter's hands without any consequence. Quite differently on the other hand – and that is the crucial point – things are standing, according to the evangelist's view, with the healing of the demon-possessed man in the synagogue. This deed occurred in broad *public*. And this deed really was a *wonder*. Because the rabbi stranger had freed a possessed one from his evil demon! Naturally, such in the synagogue publically occurring event was spreading like wildfire through the whole town – which is also explicitly confirmed by the evangelist with the words: "*and immediately his fame spread throughout all the region...*" We now learn even from the evangelist himself what the cause is, for which in the evening, the "whole town"

with all sick gathered before Simon's house: the on the same day occurring *demon healing in the synagogue* was the cause. With this realisation, the synagogue story proves to be *necessarily* belonging into the narration context! (Even if now, it shall by no means be denied, that this context is consciously carried out "folkloristically-bumpy".) So, there can no longer be any talk of a cracking up of the context. The synagogue scene can be diagnosed as a wedged-in break of style only by somebody being layer-addicted. Only if we want to forcefully break the context, for the sake of his hypothesis, by any means and in any case, then we discover the desired breaks in these places.

Hirsch's first big attempt at presenting the narration context as broken up in the beginning of the Mark gospel on the grounds of literary-critical considerations has miserably failed. With this first sample, the core of critique of the utilised method has proven to be – *arbitrariness*.

By degrees, the reader will have become curious, just why *Hirsch* is so intent on revealing by all means the synagogue story as inserted? To the ones in the know, the real reason is surprisingly clear to see, and it has nothing to do with literary critique at all. It has to be considered that as a liberal theologian, *Hirsch* began his literary-critical analysis under certain *presuppositions*. Long before he thought of being active as a layer seeker, one thing stood like a rock for our theologian: that the gospels *also* contained many myths and legends. Naturally, this conviction that *Hirsch* shares with all critical theologians is justified; and in Books 1 and 2, I have produced oodles of evidence for the undeniable fact myself. (However, things do not stand so, that a historical core had originally existed which has subsequently been interspersed with community legend; but a priori, everything narrated is fiction. Thus, a historical core has never existed.) *For every theologian now, there lay an enormous stone of contention in the synagogue scene*. Because the unclean spirit gives away an amazing secret about the human being Jesus of Nazareth: "*I know who you are – the holy one of god.*" Of

what nobody had the first idea, the "demon" senses it and knows it, and cries out in the synagogue: this human being Jesus is – the messiah! Naturally, such a story is pure legend – Hirsch said to himself together with all other liberal theologians. In order to recognise that sort of legend, he truly need not have pursued literary analysis. However, such obvious legends, especially if they arouse dogmatic discomfort, should simply lend themselves to being treated, even scientifically, as "*insertions*", so that with justification and a clean conscience, they can be eliminated from the real, original mass as a later layer.

Hirsch cannot quite avoid occasionally admitting the element of arbitrariness of his "critical" procedure. In the temptation story for example, the for liberal theologians fatal words are uttered: "*tempted by Satan*" and "*the angels ministered to him*". Naturally, according to *Hirsch*, the "first" narrator, the man of the iron factuality, has never written down something legendary as this! Such dogmatic reflections, it goes without saying, can only be attributed to a second author. If we now ask *Hirsch* for the scientific, i.e. the literary-critical 'why' however, he must stammer embarrassedly: "*This is more of an emotional judgement that is lacking an imperative reasoning*".¹⁹⁷ As a last resort, the following explanation seems somewhat imperative to him to be able to transfer "Satan" and "the angels" to the account of a second author. *Hirsch* reckons: if we take as original the information, that Jesus had been wonderfully fed by angels during his entire stay in the desert, then "*from such starting idea..., the legend of the forty-day fasting (as Matthew and Luke report) could never [have] grown*". Very true. In real life of primeval Christianity however, equally as little could the community legend have contradicted itself in its fantasy results, so that *on the one hand*, it would fictionalise that Jesus had been fed by angels throughout the whole forty days, and *on the other hand*, that he had been fasting for forty days, and only subsequently had been ministered to by the angels. (After all, according to *Hirsch*, the interference by Satan and the angels is supposedly quite without a question also legend.)

The above textbook example has opened our eyes to the fact that the by Hirsch handled literary-critical method is for the largest part founded upon arbitrariness and factually not justified intuition.

VIII. Defeat of the layer separators in the struggle for a historic core in the overall gospels

We can no longer hold a high opinion of the critical sharpness of the by *Hirsch* utilised layer-separation method, once we had to recognise that arbitrariness and unfounded intuition are prominent attributes of this *modus operandi*. Equally as little as previously *Thiel* has *Hirsch* produced positive evidence for a construction of the Mark gospel of three layers. It is necessary^{LII} to further observe *Hirsch* with his endeavour.

We continue the examination by extracting a second sample from the work results of the literary Mark separator *Hirsch*. This time, it is about the important *messiah question* (not messiah secret!). Has Jesus really considered himself to be the Jewish messiah? When did he reveal himself as such to his disciple and the people? In this question, all our interest is focused on the evangelist Mark; because together with *Hirsch*, we have to investigate how the gospel's author has presented the situation. That the affair is treated mysteriously in the gospel, has already been hinted at earlier¹⁹⁸, and also that all sorts of contradictions appear in it.

LII Is it really? To me, it appears that since the beginning of Book 3, especially since the stag (*Hirsch*) has turned up, Kammeier is flogging a dead horse here. It doesn't really matter how much you refute these 'researchers' and 'theologists' and whatever else they think they are – it's similar to the story with the hare and the tortoise. First, they always deny, deny, deny, and if that won't do it anymore, they simply invent some other novel nonsense with which Kammeier and others (e.g. Kammeier's 'translator') are frittering their lives away.

Like his predecessors, *Hirsch* also believes in being able to explain the striking contradictions in the messiah description in the sense of his layer hypothesis. That is, he wants to effect this scientifically, by literary analysis of the text. On this point, how do things stand with his science?

For *Hirsch*, the famous scene near *Caesarea Philippi* (Mark 8,27) is in its core historical and authentic; he eliminates only a few trifles as added later. In this scene, Peter declares on Jesus' question, who he were, that he is *Christ*, i.e. the by God sent Jewish messiah-King. According to *Hirsch*, Jesus accepts this confession and does not object, but he modifies the content of the messiah idea in a significant way. Namely, he now explains – in *Hirsch's* view – to the disciples, that he would not have to go to Jerusalem as the glorious and victorious messiah, as they erroneously thought previously, but as a *suffering* messiah (as the son of man). Peter does in no way want to understand and accept this suffering role of the messiah Jesus, and is being reprimanded as "Satan" for that reason.

This harsh address and reprimand of the future cornerstone apostle has always been viewed by the bible critics as obvious evidence for *this incident being historical*, that it really must have occurred. *Hirsch* also shares this view, and emphasises that this story could only stem from the *first* narrator, namely from Mark I-Peter. The argument for the alleged historicity of this scene is this: it is impossible that the community legend should have invented this scene in which Peter is called "Satan" by Jesus. Certainly, in real life of the primeval Christians, it would have probably been almost impossible to subsequently impute to the apostle Peter a for his reputation so unfavourable address by Jesus. It would certainly have been impossible that this slander would have found willing acceptance in the christian communities. *However, it even stands in the sanctioned Mark gospel*. It follows that this address cannot be invented, it must be "historical" – or so the argument goes. And indeed, the Christians of the second generation – instead of inventing such thing – have taken offence by

the ominous naming of Peter. For that reason, Matthew and Luke completely omit this bit. Unfortunately, in their joy over having pointed out primeval historical rock, the theologists do not notice the fatal other side of the problem. If the Christians of the second generation could allegedly no longer bear Peter's upsetting reprimand, then how come, that the already familiar "plumber" R (the by *Hirsch* discovered third author who has shuffled together the sub-gospels Mark I and Mark I) did *not also* think of taking offence? According to *Hirsch*, R was of course also a man of the second generation. Then how come, that R's work with his offensive bit was so easily introduced in all communities? Why was this regrettable address not immediately eliminated from the Mark gospel as well? After all, else in those legend-ridden times, they were not troubled by arbitrarily improving the text of the gospels. However, the actual riddle now only lies in the fact, that not only the second, but also the third and fourth and all following generations *have never eliminated the embarrassing Peter reprimand in the Mark gospel*, although during the first four centuries, the text of all gospels was permanently caught in transition. (The things pertinent to the text variants of the oldest writings of the NT have already been mentioned in Book 1.) So, the problem of the Peter address has thus two sides: on the one hand, in real life, such slander would not have been subsequently invented and generally disseminated; on the other hand, in real life, a historical fact of this kind – if one had even dared to fix it in writing in the first place – would have very soon disappeared from the gospel text again. That the embarrassing fact has not been radically suppressed, or much rather, that it even stands in the Mark gospel, proves *that "one" did not intend to suppress it!* Unwittingly, the table of the line of evidence has turned, because the unfavourable fact – by it being left standing in the Mark gospel – speaks especially against the historicity of the reported situation.

Indeed, in real life of primeval Christianity, such unfavourable word on Peter could not have been invented. In the late medieval forgery headquarters however, "unfavourables"

could be and had to be invented without any pangs of conscience about fictionalised persons (not only about Peter, but about Jesus as well), if the believers were to be influenced in an edifying sense *by a negative example*. Something very important still adds to this. Multiple times already (in each Book of "*The Falsification of German History*"), I have pointed out the most effective of all cunning forgery practices: nothing improves the appearance of authenticity of falsified tradition so extraordinarily as do the tactics of *occasionally, in full deliberation*, reporting *unfavourable things* about one's (fictionalised) hero.

Let us stay with Peter's reprimand for another moment. In the reported situation, such reprimand in the sharpest form was unavoidable and by all means necessary; because what Peter undertook here, his attempt to distract Jesus from his divine mission of the suffering messiah (son of man), had to be brought to the consciousness of not only the "tempter" Peter, but to all disciples as the most monstrous sin. How can Jesus fulfil the by God ordered work of redemption, should he *not* suffer much for the sins of the world, should he *not* shed his blood for saving mankind?

Once already, a tempter, Satan himself, had wanted to alienate Jesus from his suffering redeemer task by the promise of all might and glory of this world.^{LIII} (Mark only reports with sparing words that Jesus has been tempted by Satan; he thus assumes that his readers have already knowledge of the individual stages of the temptation.) With the harshest words, the satanic element of such disposition had to be brought to the consciousness of the new tempter (Peter) as well. That means that this reprimand is not to be thought of and

LIII This sentence contains the blueprint for how freemasonry recruits (particularly the more talented) vain individuals for their secret societies. And they have the means to fulfil their promises, too; that is, all of them, not just the usual fame and fortune, but also e.g. the 'promise' to *murder* the novice should they break the vow of silence. *Their* law always supersedes public law, regardless of where in the world they are, i.e. they are a law onto themselves, and they get away with it every time 1. because of the secrecy and 2. because the representatives of the public law (government, police commissioners, judges etc.) are mostly also freemasons (e.g. the British 'Royal' family, US presidents, the Wiltshire Police Commissioner etc.) Finding this blueprint in the bible, of all places, also demonstrates just *how* old freemasonry (secret societies) is, *and* with whom it originates.

perceived as the disciple Peter's telling off, but it is intended to be a necessary education of the entire discipleship on the true nature and task of Jesus' messiahdom. The canonical Mark evangelist had no cause at all to take offence with the harsh reprimand of Peter; to the contrary, this scene with just this "satanic" climax *had to* go into the gospel for the sake of the cause, i.e. the dogma. And *for that reason*, the word of reprimand has never been removed from this gospel.

By the way, according to *Hirsch*, the "first" narrator from whom this scene yet stems, was supposedly none other than Peter! So, *Peter himself* would have completely carefreely handed down his harsh Satan reprimand to posterity.

We now turn back again to the actual layer topic. So, *Hirsch* considers the scene of Caesarea Philippi to be historical, and has it thus originate with the first narrator (Mark I). Contemplating this tale, our critic has perceived that here (with the confession of Peter), a cardinal point of Jesus' public life becomes visible; this is the moment in which Jesus has revealed himself to the disciples as Christ (son of man) *for the first time*! It cannot be denied that the tale *can* be understood (albeit not *must* be understood) in this meaning of the first-time aspect. There is an obstacle in the path of this interpretation however. Namely, in the Mark gospel, there is already *previously* talk of the *son of man* on Jesus' lips, that is, in these cases already, Jesus is indicating that he is this son of man: how does the earlier revelation fit in with the first-time aspect of such revelation in the story of Caesarea? As a layer separator, *Hirsch* is not troubled for an explanation. These earlier cases, it goes without saying, must be booked to the account of the community legend. When asked why, *Hirsch* slightly unwillingly replies: "*However, that the [earlier; K.] exceptions... could have only been created by an interference with the first narrator, should be self-explanatory.*"¹⁹⁹ A most remarkable argument! Since *we* are not layer-addicted, such assumption is not at all *self-explanatory* for us. Much rather, we must insist on some evidence. If *Hirsch* replies to that:

"Else in Mark I, the strict rule is followed that Jesus talks of the son of man only after the confession of Peter, more in the intimate circle of the apostles, and only in the context of the secret of the suffering", then this suggestive hint at the layer Mark I completely fails its purpose as evidence. After all, the "strict" rule does not have its place of origin in the object (text), but in the subject (the critic *Hirsch*); because yet again, *Hirsch* assumes what he must still prove: that there are really layers in the Mark gospel.

Hirsch feels that despite the "...self-explanatory...", he owes us real evidence for the claim, that the son-of-man-instances from before the Peter-admission do not belong to the original stock of the gospel. By means of a literary-critical analysis, we are meant to be convinced of it; and we do not want to miss out on this test sample of the method. The one relevant place is in Mark 2,10, and it deals with the son of man's authority to forgive sins on Earth. This bit is supposedly inserted. Why? "*The verse is a grammatical embarrassment, it stands ... hard in the context* [This sentence is a linguistic embarrassment. Orig.: "... er steht... hart im Zusammenhang" – Ouch!]." ²⁰⁰, Now, it can and shall not be denied that the context comes across as awkward [not as awkward as *Hirsch*'s waffle], but have we not already pointed out a dozen times, that the *one* (canonical) author of the Mark gospel, as a simple folklore narrator, principally writes awkwardly, that he in particular produces bumpy transitions? Must it then be said once again that here, as in all other points, nothing is gained by shifting the difficulty? That it is merely arbitrariness to burden a second and third author with that, of which the first author shall be cleared? Why, a first author is only conjured up, forced onto the scene, constructed, invented – only for the sake of a certain desire, namely to gain an "original" narrator who is not yet inflicted with legend addiction. Equally, later narrators are only forced to appear in order to load them with everything legendary. *Truly given, palpably extant however, is only the one author, the canonical evangelist Mark*. All inconsistencies, contradictions, rugged transitions are the burden of *this one given* writer,

who has been proven to be a folkloristic-awkward author. Short and sweet: to view the rugged transition in this place as proof for layer formation, is bare arbitrariness.

Hirsch references still a second reason for his thesis. It is based upon the fact that in this early place, indeed for the first time in the gospel, the mysterious term 'son of man' is uttered. On this, the critic explains: "*Without any preparation, the reference to the authority of the son of man would have been meaningless towards the listeners.*" That seems to make sense. In reality, Jesus would probably not out of nothing, not for the first time, have spoken of the 'son of man' without prior informing his listeners on the meaning of this term. Let us therefore just assume, that this son-of-man-sentence had indeed not yet been written down by the first narrator (i.e. it originates with a third party); then, especially then, a different, still greater meaninglessness is the result regarding the whole scene! That is, the meaninglessness forms because of the missing son-of-man bit, of all things! Let us picture the relevant early scene. Jesus is asked to heal a paralytic. Instead of immediately fulfilling the request for healing, Jesus carries out a totally different, a quite unforeseen, a downright monstrous deed: he puts himself in God's place, and proclaims to the paralytic: your sins are forgiven! What in the eyes of the gathered ones only God alone can fulfil, here, a human being, this man from Nazareth is usurping. It makes no wonder that the present scribes perceive this usurpation as blasphemy. Now, if the son-of-man bit were missing – as *Hirsch* wants – then it becomes nonsensical, that not only completely unpreparedly something monstrous and unbelievable is presented to the listeners, but that also over the course of the whole scene, no word of explanation on the side of Jesus is uttered, *why he, just he, of all people*, is entitled and authorised to forgive sins. The situation demands *some* explanation. And this explanation is now somewhat skilfully given by the author of the canonical gospel by the fact, that he has Jesus *talk and act as the son of man*. Thus, this son-of-man-revelation must not be simply omitted. If *Hirsch* leaves it unreprimanded, that his first narrator, in the story of the calling,

completely unpreparedly addresses the four fishermen with the prompt to follow him, then he should not force about another narrator in this case (and in all other cases), either.

Arbitrariness has been proven to be the main characteristic of the by *Hirsch* utilised layer separation method. *Hirsch* has not perhaps *wanted* to proceed arbitrarily [I'm not so sure about this...]; we may assume that *Hirsch* is subjectively really convinced of not reading anything into the text, but out of it, "discovering". All the more it is necessary to point out this fundamental error of his.

Joining the arbitrariness in the layer separation procedure is the *inconsequence*, or much rather, the one causes the other. We already had to register multiple cases of methodical inconsequence. A particularly crass example shall now be discussed; because this is an inconsequence that has a devastating effect on *Hirsch's* hypothesis, especially his first narrator. In this, we must still once more resume the confession of Peter of Caesarea.

We can imagine how proudly *Hirsch* looks upon the by him discovered sharply defined individualities Mark I, Mark II and R. Yet, in what manner has he discovered his first narrator Mark I, namely Peter? In no way by literary-critical analysis of the text, but in truth by principally lumbering a second or third author, respectively, with everything obviously legendary (everything dogmatically offensive to a modern liberal theologian). Naturally, after completion of such transactions, his first narrator stands there with no (dogmatic) flaw, as the man of iron factuality, opposed to any "dogmatic reflection". *Hirsch* rams it home to us, that this original author, as a human being, Christian, and author is characterised by the fact *that he is no dogmatic reflectionist*. We want to take this statement regarding the first narrator to heart. And we want to remind ourselves now as well, that this excellent author, according to *Hirsch*, is none other than – Peter!

So, the objectivity giant Peter has not been a dogmatic reflectionist, *Hirsch* assures with all emphasis. He must not have been that, either, because else, his iron, by nothing blurred factuality would be worryingly endangered. In the same moment, in which the writer Peter were to be caught in dogmatic reflections, the entire by *Hirsch* erected hypothesis structure would have its foundation removed: *in the smoke of the dogmatic reflection, the community legend would become visible. Hirsch must suppress the slightest suspicion in this regard, he must discover a by all means dogmatically immune first narrator, else the whole layer seeking would have failed its practical purpose.*

A potential methodical inconsequence regarding Peter's sharply defined mental disposition would have to have a fatal effect. Has *Hirsch* been aware of this circumstance? It does not appear that way; because else, he would have probably hardly managed to completely blur the contours of his pretty, unique character image of Peter by the most striking *inconsequence*.

Now, of what does the methodical running-off-track consist? Of the fact that *Hirsch* has the first narrator, i.e. Peter, narrate so uncommonly thoroughly reflected stories as self-experienced, such as Mark 8,27 ff. (confession of Peter) and Mark 9,2 ff. (Jesus' transfiguration).

According to *Hirsch*, before the confession of Peter near Caesarea Philippi, Jesus, as is well-known, has supposedly never openly spoken of his attribute as the Christ (son of man) even towards his disciples. When he now asks them: "*Who do men say that I am?*", there is *Peter* who answers and confesses: "*You are the Christ*". Although, according to *Hirsch*, Jesus has never revealed himself as the messiah before Caesarea, *Peter*, of all people, has worked out just which secret is looming about the master. This truly not trivial answer *assumes* with Peter all sorts of remarkable reflection, that is, reflections of a dogmatic nature. Or, offhand:

that Peter had reached the conviction that Jesus is the Christ, shows to us that he must have been an intense "dogmatic reflectionist". He who finds this answer in themselves is a full-blooded reflectionist. This is confirmed by the *story of the transfiguration*. Here, Peter reports how he has heard a voice that said about Jesus: "*This is my beloved son.*" *Hirsch* will now probably reply: this is not reflection, but this is a *vision in combination with audition*.^{*} So, regarding the story of transfiguration, *Hirsch* wants to rule out reflection when claiming the fact of a vision (audition). However, this way out also remains blocked; because such a distinct vision has as a psychological precondition an earlier distinct – reflection! Really, in this manner then, a for *Hirsch* fatal result turns out. By being so careless and inconsequent to attach to his first narrator, namely Peter, such well-reflected own experiences, he himself destroys the by him artificially generated sharp definition of the iron-factual individuality of his author. Peter, who in line with the hypothesis should not and must not be a "reflectionist", is involuntarily by *Hirsch* himself revealed to be a dogmatic thinker of grand style. And also: how do things stand with the sense of reality of a person to whom visions and auditions are peculiar? Can such a person report iron-factually?

* Some otherwise worthless legendary fabric is being saved as in the core historical by assuming the presence of a "quite possible vision". As is well-known, according to liberal theology, the alleged formation of the primevally christian community is also based upon the resurrection vision of Jesus' disciples, primarily that of Peter.

Arbitrariness and inconsequence as essential factors of a scientific layer separation method: this constitutes a devastating verdict over the with such method gained results. As a third essential factor of this method however, we have to still name *intuition*. The scientist *Hirsch* manages to proclaim with a deadpan face: "*There is a certain intuitive recognition of the original... and in dealing with the gospels, he who does not gradually acquire a guiding feeling that lets him recognise the reality behind the play of the broken lights and images,*

cannot be helped by any scientific art, either."²⁰¹ [Except perhaps by the science of waffle. You know – "the style"...] Scientific art as the servant of intuitive recognition. This confession is characteristic. *Intuition*: a beautiful and necessary thing there, where its place is, e.g. in the business of a poet and artist. Even in science, *occasionally*, intuition "occurs" as a stroke of genius. It can never be an essential factor of a logical-critical method however. He who calls (*must* call) upon intuition for help in the factual-logical process of literary-critical analysis, gives away their inner insecurity, is at the end of their "scientific art".

"*Again, without a with Mark I acquired feeling for what is authentic and original, one cannot reach the target with this analysis, either*" – Hirsch admits in another place.²⁰² Hirsch claims to have "acquired" the guiding feeling with Mark I. We could acquire the feeling only with a *given* first narrator! Now, an original narrator is by no means given however, but he is only arbitrarily (by desire) *assumed*. The wish is the producer of an allegedly first narrator!; because Hirsch wishes to discover a narrator in the Mark gospel who is no dogmatic reflectionist, but only iron-factually reports pure facts – *for that reason* such an author shall and must be sought and found. In his volume 1, Hirsch confirms these tactics for us: "*As soon as one has decided* [namely to lumber an editor with anything dogmatically inconvenient; K.]... *one gains a meaningful and well narrated text for the first narrator.*"²⁰³ Naturally! All we have to do is "decide" to carry out such transactions, then the original narrator is necessarily created in the wonderful sheen of his factuality and clarity. If we are even a priori, principally determined to seek an iron-factual author, then there is no doubt at all that as a result of the procedure of clearance, this objectivity giant is indeed found. We have thus the following situation: Hirsch has not subsequently acquired his guiding feeling with the "given" Mark I, much rather, his guiding feeling (i.e. the desire to find a purely factual first narrator) has already existed *before* any critical analysis, and he has created the

alleged Mark I by acts of arbitrariness in the first place. The guiding feeling is not effect, but cause.

Not without good cause have I dealt with the literary critic *Hirsch* and his "scientific" method across three chapters. I was charged with the urgent task of opening the eyes of all new-testamentarian researchers about the true nature (or un-nature, respectively) of the gospel source-searching via a thorough critique of the most recent relevant case, in order to nip in the bud any potentially appearing future cases of layer addiction. The realisation that (and why) all search for layers (sources) in the gospels *must* invariably very soon degenerate into intuition and arbitrariness will likely put an end to any further attempts. The critical searchlight throughout the synoptical problem has shown to us, that the root cause for the invariable failure of all efforts lay in the particularly strongly defined trickiness of the subject: namely, we are *not* dealing *with a naturally generated* (and thus, not to be explained by natural means, either) phenomenon, *but with an artificially generated one*. The synoptical main question, including all sub-questions (the question of layers as well) are purely questions of vexation. Facing them, nothing is gained with science; only with *arbitrariness, inconsequence and intuition*, we reach the "goal".

It was arbitrariness that let *Thiel* discover dozens of duplicates in the Mark gospel; and arbitrariness was the dissection knife with which *Wendling* stylistically split the text of the gospel into three portions: into the simple-clear, the dramatic and the stupid-clever portion. There is simply no method of layer separation that would not be contaminated with the element of (more or less scientifically disguised) arbitrariness.

We could now carry on pointing out by new examples that regarding the scientific quality, things do not stand any better with the by other critics handled methods. As educating as these demonstrations would again turn out to be in some details, it would only

mean, that we would have to quite unnecessarily establish time and again that such layer separation attempts – that have been carried out on the other gospels as well – one and all, fizzle out in often grotesque acts of arbitrariness. It therefore also makes no wonder, if all results of the art of layer separation – as the example of the Mark gospel shows – sharply contradict each other. There is only *one* method that is capable of producing solid and ultimate results: *the absolute method*. In this Book, too, we have zealously utilised it, and it is only thanks to its utilisation, that we have recognised the synoptical question to be an artificially generated one that can therefore not be solved by natural means at all. The important synoptical sub-question: are there layers in the gospels that allow the conclusion of a literary-critical *process of development?*, could also be answered by the use of the absolute method, that is, in the negative sense. As is well-known, the nature of the method consists of subjecting the behind the gospels (or the hypothetical sub-gospels) standing "primevally christian" authors, or, more accurately: the psychology of these alleged authors to a critical examination. And this examination of primevally christian mental and spiritual life resulted in the defeat of the hypothesis, that the gospels were final stages of a literary development that finds its expression in the precipitation of layers. During the course of our investigation of various layer separation hypothesis', the presumed aspect of "it goes without saying" of this assumption has gradually withered away ever more, and we had to realise that all the relevant "primevally christian" authors are not figures of historical reality, but represent phantoms generated from speculative ingredients of modern gospel critics.

Book 4

The uniform origin of all gospels

Introduction

In the third part, we have observed the show, how theologians and non-theologians, enticed by a fata morgana of the "original", have, ever anew, endeavoured advances through the sandy desert of legends of the gospels, in order to finally reach the hotly desired historical source of the Jesus fiction. We have experienced that none of these seekers has been able to discover the so certainly assumed historical oasis; regardless of where those advances have lead us, all that was found everywhere was sand, namely fiction.

To reference further examples of failed source searches would equate to wasting time. However, we cannot deny ourselves to note the downright sensational results of a gospel critique that we owe to *W Erbt*. So far, no Christian has doubted the news in the gospels, that Judas has been the traitor in Jesus' environment. *Erbt* has reached a different view: "*...that the founder of the primeval community has played a most evil part in Jesus' last hours... Thus, the traitor is Simon Peter then, who has delivered the redeemer to his enemies' knife.*"²⁰⁴ The second surprise: according to *Erbt*, Simon Peter is identical with the publican Levi-Matthew! And this critic has succeeded with yet a third discovery: the scene of Jesus' doings is "in truth" not at all Galilaea with the Sea of Galilee, but to the West of it, on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea, by the Karmel Mountains, the primevally christian events have unfolded! So, these are the "historical oasis" that the source seeker *Erbt* has found in the literary sand deserts of the gospels.

We now hold a brief preview of the main topics of the Book 4.

In the first chapter, one more time – for the last time – the critical efforts of a researcher, to gift to the world an original Mark gospel, cleansed of the legend chaos, is assessed. We are interested in the critical method that has been utilised in this; so, for a change, we let a variant specialist speak, who presents to us the – of course failing – trick,

how to reinstate the (allegedly) original text by sifting through the gigantic pile of the various versions of the handwritings.

From the 2nd chapter on, the main topic of this script is being discussed. All attention now focuses on the crucial *question of the origin and provenance of the gospels*, and in close connection with this, the question of *the practical purpose* of this big literary undertaking. The general result of our versatile line of evidence is this: *all four gospels* (including all new-testamentarian scripts) *are of uniform origin*, they stem from one and the same workshop. The literary organism of the gospels is unmistakably branded with the attributes of their uniform birth. These are, as it were, literary quadruplets of one fictionist mother, i.e. a joint big enterprise of medieval philosophers, fictionists and moralists [, but mostly satanically criminal history destroyers/falsifiers!]. Our evidence is based upon, among others, the discovered blueprint of the gospel structure, and the realisation of the secret driving force of the artificial action mechanism of the Jesus fiction. We have thus obtained the manufacturing secrets. The final element of the line of evidence consists of the revelation of the exceedingly practical ultimate purpose of the big gospel fiction: *the four-fold overall gospel reveals itself as the divine certificate of appointment for the christian priesthood*.

I. A researcher of variants in search for the 'original' text

"A clear and vivid concrete historical image of Christ is the quite unavoidable condition for the truth and the health of the christian piety", so the Karlsruhe theologist R Rothe once wrote.²⁰⁵ Today on the one hand, in liberal circles as well, such unconditional necessity of an as concrete as possible "historical" image of Jesus is thought of remarkably mildly, because

all insightful people can no longer deny that despite the most zealous work, a vivid image of the "historical" Jesus could still not yet be gained. On the other hand however, there is by no means any lack of die-hard individuals who happily subject themselves to the Sisyphean work to again dig up the original Jesus from the heap of rubble of the legend. These unteachables are chasing a phantom. That this is in fact the case, has already been completely clarified by a multitude of evidence during our previous investigations, as far as they were concerned with the category of layer seekers.

Besides source and layer separators, there still are with other methods working critics concerned with the problem of the primeval aspect in the gospel reports. Amongst them, the *variant specialists* stick out as a particular class. Those are the subject of this chapter. So, these critics have the most important of the old gospel handwritings before them, and they compare the relevant wording (text) handed down in them with each other. Almost regularly, there are deviations (variants) found. Their method now consists of picking out from the gigantic heap of new-testamentarian variants those versions that according to the relevant researcher, must be the "primeval" ones. The variant experts, too, are going particularly for the Mark gospel as the allegedly first created gospel script. The reader has already in Book 1 of this here work been informed by what the tale is hanging with these variants in reality. For the time being however, they will be well advised to suspend their better insight for a short while, and to placidly accept, in line with the common opinion, the various versions as a necessary side effect of the "natural" origin and development of the new-testamentarian text.

Besides others, *E Winkel* has gifted us a "primeval" Mark gospel. In the following, our investigation will be concerned with this variant critic and his method.

Winkel has openly admitted what caused him to scientifically concern himself with the realm of text variants: "*The cause and justification to such an idea of the task* [namely to

have Jesus' "real words" arise again in their "immediateness"; K.] *lies in the situation of our times*."²⁰⁶ So, the trigger was the (religious) situation of our times – or just how *Winkel* understands the situation. And he understands it as the demand for the Jesus image the way it once, cleansed of so-called later ingredients, has allegedly looked in its original freshness. *Winkel* does not doubt for one moment that there has [supposedly] been a historical Jesus; and to him, there is no question that especially this Jesus of "history" is imperiously demanded by the situation of the times. Inspired and unwittingly lead by the situation of the times, he turns – for the purpose of confirming his view – to an investigation of the mass of variants. Now, it is the nature (more accurately: un-nature) of the variants to be *versatile*, and to offer something to every subjective view; so, only a naive soul can thus be surprised if *Winkel* also finds *his* view "confirmed" by the diagnosis of the text variants established by him. This is just the way it is: orthodox or liberal folk of any ilk can shout into woods of variants – and everybody will hear *their* echo.^{LIV}

Winkel has a bad start. He actually does not even need to begin, because he already knows very well beforehand what the reward of the research flight into the empire of versions will be. It is not unknown to *Winkel* that according to the view of many new-testamentarians, the real core of Jesus' proclamation is considered the crass *opposition* in which it stands to the Jewish *legal justice*. *Winkel* unconditionally agrees with this view; to him, it is a priori so solidly founded, that he elevates it to be the starting point of his variant research, especially since to him, this opposition offhand constitutes the main characteristic of the "situation of the times". Now, *Winkel* has discovered something psychologically remarkable: "*Jesus stood in times of the strongest religious-political hopes in Judaism. Especially for that reason however, from a psychological perspective, it is extraordinarily remarkable and strange that he, although raised and grown up within the atmosphere of back-then Israel, so uniquely*

LIV German expression: as you shout into the woods, it sounds back out of them; i.e. you shout friendly, it echoes back sounding friendly, angry echoes angrily etc.

rejects the typical attributes in terms of religious disposition and the hope of this people... so... the religious-ethical struggle for justice of this people... As it is equally understandable on the other hand, that those who later proclaimed him [the disciples; K.], again attributed such [namely legal justice; K.] to him out of the self-esteem of their folkloristically attached nature..."²⁰⁷ [Sounds like "the style", or a "style" derivative, to me.]

Jesus: opponent of Jewish legal justice, the disciples after the master's death again followers of the law – the "historical fact" forms the basis of all *Winkelian* variant science. We now want to inspect this basis a little, because it is of course, as mentioned, the starting point of the research flight. Namely, *Winkel* further argues: "*Of Jew-Christianity, Peter included, we know that it has later respected the Jewish law again. So, an opposition against the law cannot have originated from the disciple tradition. This means, only from Jesus himself...*"²⁰⁸ This conclusion seems flawless, and yet, something is not right here, something that seems to not have caused *Winkel* any concerns however. Previously of course, he has presented as understandable that later, the *disciples* have *again respected* the previously *rejected law* after Jesus' example. *Winkel* must permit that we most vigorously object. Because we find such complete turnaround of the disciples' religious sensitivities not understandable, but simply inconceivable. We claim that such transformation, as an event in "real" life of the primeval Christians, would not only have been mysterious, but absolutely impossible. In order to realise this, simply consider the more detailed circumstances: under Jesus' eyes, the disciples had, like their master, *lived and felt free from any law*. So, not perhaps thoughtlessly, much less customarily, but because their master had presented the *freedom from any law* as the centre of his proclamation, and lived it as an example. After Jesus' death now, these disciples "experienced" the well-known resurrection visions, this means however, they gained the rocksteady conviction that their master had risen from the dead and been elevated to heavenly glory. We are to simply realise just what such

psychological "facts" mean to the people involved: *obliging* revelations! These humans who, by the "fact" of the resurrection, had only just received divine proof that the by the elevated one proclaimed doctrine (the freedom from any law) be true – be obliging – they should, one and all, immediately after their experiences of truth, have again consciously fallen back, against the words and deeds of their heavenly master, to painfully fulfilling the law, and should thus have most harshly insulted and denied the resurrected one and his teachings? Psychologically, this is absolutely impossible. However, it is yet handed down in the Acts, that the disciples, including Peter, had really acted so treacherously – *Winkel* will reply to us. Indeed: they act so on paper! They act so as invented phantom figures in thin air.

Winkel's start is going badly. Since, as we have recognised, it would be a psychological impossibility, that the disciples could have promptly denied the central doctrine of their elevated master, then indeed vice versa, the by the disciples "testified" respect for the law should thus be traced back to – the words and deeds of Jesus himself. So, Jesus himself must have stood up for the fulfilment of Jewish legal justice. Why should not we argue *like that vice versa*? Impossible, many theologians will be quick to object together with *Winkel*. And again, quite rightfully so. After all, has it not often and emphatically enough been proven in the gospels that "in reality", Jesus had lived completely free from any law, and taught accordingly? Certainly: he lives and teaches so on paper! The fatal thing is however, that the same Jesus turns out quite differently on paper as well, namely "really" as the teacher of the most rigid Jewish legality who rams it home to his followers that not the tiniest bit of the law were to perish. Yet again, we have unwittingly been caught in a dilemma trap: Jesus has supposedly taught freedom from any law and simultaneously respect for the law! There are enough theologians who loftily stand above such trifles, and who will find no fault with shutting the left or right critical eye, as required, in order to overlook the relevant "other side". Others weasle out with the explanation that Jesus may have *taught* law-

abidingly, but that he has *lived* free from any law. Theologians who feel the desire to decide, free themselves from this dialectical trap in a no longer uncommon way: they simply declare the one side – mostly Jesus' law-abiding proclamation – a later dogmatic falsification and imputation. *Winkel* also stands on the side of these explainers. Since these are christian theologians, it goes without saying, that their critical perception decides against legal justice and for freedom of any law. The arbitrariness of such decision strikes the eye. The main weight of the psychological counter-arguments – that the proclaimed total turnaround in the disciples' soul is psychologically impossible – is not considered worthy of any further attention. This is the case with *Winkel* as well: his decision in the law dilemma also springs from arbitrariness. With this however, the *precondition* of his entire critical action proves to be a failure already.

Nonetheless, we also want to observe *Winkel* as a variant specialist at work now. Why does he actually undertake this arduous journey into the jungle of variants yet? With the help of the "original" versions, he wants to reinstate the "original" Jesus proclamation. So, his research task consists of finding out, which ones amongst the swarm of variants are the original versions. A difficult and dangerous task, some readers are probably thinking. Just how will *Winkel* manage to distinguish which among the versions is good and bad, original and secondary? No worries however, *Winkel* is most excellently equipped for his task. He says it himself, what makes him first choice for the solution of the variant problem: his "*subtle intuition for authentic and unauthentic coinage*".²⁰⁹ Now, to him who possesses "subtle intuition", the most difficult science is child's play. Unfortunately, with *Winkel*, the origin of his feeling proves to be worrying: namely, the subtle intuition springs from the murky complex of the *Winkelian* presupposition of Jesus' alleged opposition to the law. So, this is a fluid of arbitrariness.

At first, *Winkel* feels up the *codices* of the NT as a whole. With this procedure, he gains the result that as a text critic, we have to give up the pretty belief of finding the primeval text in some random "old" handwriting, or handwriting groups, respectively. So, *Winkel* should have no preference for any handwriting or group, either. We nonetheless notice him to be biased towards D, Syrians and early Latiners, against S and B. How does this work out? Just how come, that *Winkel* is storming against the ones preferring S and B: "*These people should be driven off their lecterns with a whip*"? And just from where does *his* preference for D, Syrians and early Latiners stem? The riddle's solution is hiding in *Winkel's* "subtle intuition" for the original! The handwritings such as D, Syrians and early Latiners, are preferred, because they favour the *Winkelian* prerequisites, i.e. because they *show law-rejecting and otherwise undogmatic variants*. Such versions are most welcome to *Winkel* as suiting the situation of the times. Naturally, it is no great art to find them, it only takes patience, much patience to flick through hundreds of handwritings in search for such undogmatic versions. For *Winkel* does not leave it at the mentioned handwritings, he also references many more still, in order to revere them as testimony to the primeval text, should they contain dogma-free variants by any chance. Eventually, the religious situation of our times (the way *Winkel* understands it) is, and always remains, the magic stick with which the "original" versions are produced out of the hiding place that is the handwritten tradition.

The religious situation requires for example, that *no eschatological* character must be attached to the "Empire of God" in Jesus' original proclamation. (The eschatological Empire of God is thought of as God's rule which breaks out in future, only in an uncertain ending of time.) *Winkel* is very embarrassed by the fact that according to the evangelical reports, Jesus should have supposedly considered himself the expected Jew messiah of the *ending of time*. For *Winkel*, such eschatologically sounding words must have been completely substituted later, or re-arranged from original, differently worded sayings of Jesus. Already the subtle

intuition tells us so. The falsification of the "real" words has supposedly occurred early, *Winkel* states, that is, it has occurred amongst the circle of the disciples under the supreme leadership of the "just" master brother Jacobus who, as a result of dark machinations, had managed to put himself on top of the Jerusalem primeval community.²¹⁰

We now want to study the applied text-critical procedure in detail by one example.

By the report Mark 10,32-45, *Winkel* intends to prove that it, in the to us handed down wording of the wrongfully preferred handwritings, has been *eschatologically spoiled*; the "original" had in no way been of an eschatological nature. From this place in Mark, we see that Jesus is on the way to Jerusalem with his disciples. Among the wandering crowd, there is a depressed mood, because the master had just again pointed out to his folks his impending suffering and violent death. It then carries on: then James and John... came to him, asking for a wish to be fulfilled: "*Grant us that we may sit, one on your right hand and the other on your left, in your glory.*" Without a question, this is an eschatological request. During the future messianic meal, both disciples want to sit next to the master, in seats of honour. However, Jesus refuses by relating: "*... but to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but it is for those for whom it is prepared.*"

Winkel now reassures us that this report is not original, but corrupted. He proves this first by a psychological critique of the described situation: "*This scene with the unfeeling request...is unlikely to the highest degree.*"²¹¹ Jesus talks earnestly about his suffering and dying, and just at that moment, the two disciples want to secure for themselves places of honour in the future glory. Thus, an unfeelingness of the requesters is revealing itself here, which must (in this context) be, in line with *Winkel*, considered quite improbable. Well understood: in this context. *Winkel* assumes offhand, that this request has been presented immediately, or at least very soon after the master had uttered the proclamation of suffering.

After all, in the text, the request directly follows the prediction of the suffering. However now, he who has somewhat studied the Mark gospel, and in doing so, has particularly focused their attention on the element of the chronological order, knows that especially the chronological context betrays a miserably embarrassing botch. The context is flawed beyond all measure. Mark is an author who introduces almost every sentence and every paragraph with "and", without in the slightest wanting to hint at a "historical" causal context everytime however. In the presented case as well, nothing stands in the way of viewing the scene with the disciples' request, despite the "and"-introduction, as having occurred much later than the proclamation of suffering. So, *Winkel's* psychological objection falls by the wayside. He must yet produce other evidence in order to secure the corruption, and now at last, our critic steps into action as variant expert.

In connection with the mentioned scene in Mark, the codices are sifted through. Naturally, *Winkel* finds variants this time as well. He first mentions some versions of which he remarks himself however, that it were "*barely weighty extensions as such*" offered by them. (So for example, instead of "*sit in your glory*", *Winkel's* handwriting has the extension "*sit in the Empire of your glory*".) So, this means to zealously keep flicking through the handwritings, in order to dig up truly significant versions. In one (one!) "old" handwriting (in the codex Bobb.), something is found! Or much rather, in this codex, something is missing. The word "sit" is missing! Here, the relevant text goes (with the codex Bobb., we are dealing with a "primevally old" translation): "da nobis, ut unus a dextera et unus a sinistra" (grant us that one on your right hand and one on your left").^{LV} So, the word "sit" is missing here.

Winkel states with satisfaction: "*This is indeed a completely different text, and in its brief clarity, natural and understandable to any perception. Once Jesus ... had spoken... of the*

LV Although I have not had Latin at school, I know as much as that 'da(re)' = 'give', not 'grant', and that there is also the possessive pronoun 'your' missing twice, in connection with 'dextera' and 'sinistra'. This is to say that (translating) Latin is a mostly arbitrary affair, and that Latin is an ambiguous horror show of a 'language', much worse than even English.

suffering and death, the two brothers at last go to him, and ask him to be permitted to be to his right and his left. Thus, for the sake of no other purpose than standing by him and protecting him, or to suffer with him."²¹² Hold your horses though! Firstly, this "natural and understandable" explanation is only worth anything in the first place, if we must assume (which is not necessary at all however), that between the proclamation of suffering and the disciples' request, an immediate (temporal) connection exists. Secondly, the codex Bobb., of all things, which *Winkel* is referencing after all, is playing a nasty trick on our critic; because in just this handwriting, the answer from Jesus goes, among others, like this: "... *sedere autem a dextera...* ", in English: "... *sitting [person] to my right...*" A for *Winkel* embarrassing thing: what (in the codex Bobb.) is "missing" from the *disciples' request*, is standing there clearly and distinctly in *Jesus' answer*! Thus, even the codex Bobb. is not doing Winkel the favour of confirming his thesis of the eschatologically spoiled text in terms of variants; because it can be unmistakably concluded from the answer, that there really was talk of sitting in the request as well. However, our variant researcher wants to see it confirmed by all means, that the bit in Mark had the eschatological character subsequently foisted on. It is the word "sit" that has done it to him. Whether we could not somehow render it harmless yet, i.e. make it uneschatological? Behold, a possibility is opening up. So, *Winkel* patronises us that the based-upon Aramaic word has a double meaning: on the one hand, it means "to sit", "reside", but on the other hand, it also means "to be freed" [orig.: "gelöst werden"] (namely from death – to rise up). In the above Mark place, according to *Winkel*, the second meaning is the correct one. "*What do the disciples thus request... ? To be freed from death together with him to his right and left*" – which the master refuses however, since the "being freed" is not his to give.²¹³ Yet again bad luck for *Winkel* however. The interpretation "to be freed" is outright rejected by the semantic context (in the overall scenery). After Jesus had turned down the request, the text continues: "*And when the ten* [other disciples; K.]

heard it, they began to be greatly displeased..." – over the prior immodest request of their two co-disciples! And what is then further reported (Mark 10,42-45), uniquely proves that with the request, it is indeed about a high merit, a privilege, simply sitting to the sides of the messiah, but not at all about "being freed". Therefore, the finale of the whole scene is an eyesore to *Winkel*, because with the interpretation "to sit", it refutes the whole beautiful thesis. Our critic wants to reach his objective at all cost however. Therefore, he carries out a surgical operation on the Mark text: the finale scene is simply cut off! We are told, that it does not belong in this context, but to a completely different situation "originally". However, since there is pure arbitrariness of our critic at work here, we merely take note of the by nothing justified act of mutilation by simultaneously putting an end to the Winkelian variant and text science.

II. Dynamic or static character of the overall gospels?

We now turn to the actual topic of this part of *The Falsification of the History of Primeval Christianity*. In the following, it is no longer about what is allegedly original; from now on, we will also no longer focus so much on this or that gospel, but we will now view the mass of the gospels as a whole. Our problem is this:

Do the gospels carry a static or a dynamic character? Have the new-testamentarian scripts been created in temporally consecutive order and spatially separated from each other? Or do they represent the simultaneous community product of a planful great action?

In the circle of the representatives of Jesus' historicity, as hotly as the solution to the question is contested as to which gospel had been written first, there is yet, right down the

entire orthodox-liberal line, unanimity on the "natural fact", that the gospels *had been created temporally consecutively in different places* (by different authors). It has also very rarely been doubted that *the author of the fourth gospel* had begun his work as the last evangelist. Even the "old" clerical writers had no doubt that the gospels had been created one after the other. According to *Irenaeus* (allegedly bishop to Lyon around 177), the evangelist Matthew has written first, that is, around the time during which Peter and Paul were staying in Rome together, i.e. around 61 to 66 AD. (So, we accept *temporarily, for the time being*, that Peter and Paul, like Jesus, had been historical persons!) After the death of both apostles (allegedly around 66/67), the gospel of Mark (in close connection with the lectures of Peter), and the Luke gospel (with reference to the sermon of Paul) have been created. Fatal in this report of Irenaeus is, that "*a joint effect of both main apostles to Rome... [is] not compatible with the Roman letter*", i.e. thus, "*can offer no point of reference for a temporal placement*".²¹⁴ Good old Irenaeus must have either committed an act of thoughtlessness, or he has invented the temporal placement of the Mark gospel. *Eusebius* then (allegedly living around 260/270), knows better, too: he places the creation of the Mark gospel in the 40s!²¹⁵

As has been mentioned, the modern researchers go conform with the "old" ones in the principal assumption of a consecutively occurring writing-down of the gospels on the part of various primevally christian authors, only on the question as to just *when* exactly the individual scripts are to be placed temporally, a horrible confusion of the opinions becomes apparent. Some examples for this.

1. *When the gospels have allegedly been created*

So far have been stated as the time of the Mark gospel's authorship: "*in the 50s*"²¹⁶ – "*approximately around the middle of the 60s*"²¹⁷ – "*shortly before 70*"²¹⁸ – "*approximately around the year 70*"²¹⁹ – "*soon after 70*"²²⁰ – "*in the decade after 70*"²²¹ – "*after the year*

80"²²². A rich collection! To such confusion, *Wrede* open-heartedly states: "*Researchers with essentially equal prerequisites judge sometimes so, and sometimes so.*"²²³ The temporal placement for the Mark gospel as well as the Luke gospel varies across the years 60 to 100. On occasion, they go beyond these points in time. The gospel of John, previously placed around the time of 120-130, is now being pushed back to the turn of the century on the basis of an "old" papyrus fragment (fragment of a codex of the John gospel). On the side, we curiously take note of the fact, that even the "old" ones have not been consistently of Irenaeus' opinion either, according to which the fourth gospel had been written last (around 75-95), as a supplement to the three other gospels. Because the so-called Muratory fragment (an in Milan discovered register of new-testamentarian canonical scripts) that has perhaps even been set up by a "contemporary" of Irenaeus, tells us the amazing news, that the gospel of John had been written *before* the other three gospels.

By leaving the subordinate problem of the temporal placement of the gospels to be, we will from now on focus all of our attention on the main problem; it is this: does the *axiomatic presupposition of the [temporally] consecutive creation* of the gospels rightfully exist? The extraordinary significance of this question becomes visible only when we consider, that even the radical deniers of Jesus' historicity (from *Bruno Bauer* to *Arthur Drews*) have yet still principally held on to the inherited plot of a relation of temporal succession of the four gospels (next to the Acts). According to these researchers' view, approximately around the middle of the second century, a christian "primeval fictionist" has created the basic mass of the historical Christ legend with a basic script similar to Mark, on top of which other fictionists of those myth-addicted times of the 2nd century have supposedly *consecutively* erected the four gospel structures (in their canonical form). So, by these critics, the principally permitted consecutive creation of the gospels is *merely pushed forward by one century (from the 1st to the 2nd century)*. In this context, we must put out a

reminder that in Book 1 already, we have rejected as erroneous such early temporal placement of the Christ legend's historicity process, or the temporally so early creation (invention) of the gospels, respectively, because it must fail on the rough psychological reality of those times. The fictionalisation of the historical Jesus novel, i.e. the formation of Christianity must have occurred *much, much later*.

Our main problem can no longer surprise an attentive reader of my previous writings. From the previous general results, it will have, as a consequent gradual realisation, become clear to the reader themselves, that a universal spirit (forgery association) has conceived the entire mass of the gospels (all four gospels), i.e. that all gospels have a shared origin. To reinforce this realisation shall be the task of the following investigations.

2. The forgery tactics of the three-fold variation

As we have already experienced multiple times (e.g. regarding the duration of Jesus' public work – Jesus' birth place – the "apparitions" of the resurrected one), the tactics of the deliberate contradiction of a "fact" topic extends to the minutest branches of the fictionalised action. Now, one peculiarity of the deliberate contradiction expresses itself in the conscious *three-fold* variation of the same subject, that is, *according to the pattern a - b - ab*. We show by one example what is meant by that. Within the narration beginning with Mark 1,32, and in connection with this, in the parallel reports with Matthew and Luke, the following three-fold variation is found: Mark – *all* of the sick are being brought in, and *many* are healed by Jesus; Matthew – *many* are brought, and *all* healed; Luke – *all* are brought, and *all* are healed, *too*. *With one* such event, we may think of coincidence. Another example shows the same tactics however. Mark 13,1 reports, that *one* disciple has made Jesus aware of the temple building. According to Matthew however, *all* disciples have stepped up to show the master the structure. Luke goes the middle way, and reports of *numerous* disciples steering Jesus'

attention to the temple. If there is still further evidence existing, then "coincidence" as an explanation of this phenomenon is eliminated, and we will no longer be able to deny the intended purpose of such procedure. So, we further reference: according to Mark 8,34, Jesus calls the crowd and the disciples; Matthew 16,24 only mentions the disciples; in Luke 9,23, it is undetermined – all. In the tale of the epileptic (lunatic) boy, which all synoptists bring otherwise as well in multiple variations of the details, the discussion revolves around the question: why are the *disciples* unable to drive out the demon? According to Matthew 17,20, Jesus names the lack of faith within the disciples as the cause of the inability; according to Luke 9,41, Jesus reprimands the "faithless and perverse generation", i.e. the lack of faith (including the father of the boy); Mark 9,14-29 mixes both causes, so that on the one hand, the faithlessness of the people is presented as the obstacle, but on the other, it is emphasised that the disciples not applying the correct means for the healing – namely praying and fasting – were also to blame for the failure. In Mark 2,18-22, Matthew 9,14-17 and Luke 5,33-39, the question of fasting is treated. With Mark, the questioners remain undefined, with Matthew, it is the John disciples, with Luke the Pharisees. During Jesus' interrogation before the synedrion, he is beaten. According to Matthew, it is members of the synedrion who beat Jesus; Luke describes mockery and abuse by the servants of the high council; Mark mixes by talking of "some", which in the context of the text, denotes members of the council as well as servants.

That this is no coincidence, but conscious variation, makes sense. Since the two-sources theory is also disqualified, we can in such cases no longer work with the explanation, that Luke and Matthew had each "modified" one detail of the alleged Mark template. (With this failed thesis regarding the above examples, the "coincidence", that every time a finely tuned triad of the variants becomes audible, would remain completely unexplained.) *One universal will simultaneously reveals planful conception in all (synoptical) gospels here.* This

triad of variants has not formed in "natural" development, has not gradually made an appearance together with the gospel mass consecutively reaching written precipitation, but it has been *simultaneously* struck on the keyboard of the (fictionalised) gospels. The three-fold variation does not represent a dynamic, but a static character, and it reveals to us the shared origin of all gospels by an insipid fact.

We shall be occupied still a little further with the important question: dynamic or static character of the mass of gospels? According to the prevailing view of the representatives of Jesus' historicity, as is well-known, a "historical" core of the constantly further thriving community legend has supposedly been *gradually*, purposefully transformed, and grown to the volume of the existing gospels. In this dynamic process, or so it is taught, the individual relevant gospels each form an attained development level. Since *C F Bauer*, for the first time, had in grandiose simplicity "made clear" the supposed dynamics of the primevally christian spiritual history according to the terminology of the Hegelian philosophy, and following this, had assigned the gospels their temporal placement in the clerical-dogmatic ongoing, liberal-theological research has probably repeatedly re-arranged and re-interpreted every single "fact" of this alleged development history, or entirely dismissed them again. However, the development approach as such has managed to retain its rule within these researcher circles. As we know, conscious or subconscious *community legend* was supposedly the *main driving force of this development process*; but we have also long known that in real life of "primeval Christians", such legend spectre could not have been circulating and haunting as a secretive-spooky fictionist of Jesus stories. Thus, the necessary driving force of the development process is crumbling for our researchers. And what now? Then have they not allegedly discovered clear indications for the fact of the development in the gospels? And now it turns out that the driving force which has apparently started such development is useless? What? Should even the entire development-historical approach be

disallowed and wrong for being irrelevant?

3. Dynamics or statics of the overall gospels?

While in Part 2, we have been dealing with the problem of the alleged development of the *oral* overall tradition, we must now take a look at the supposed development process primarily in the period of the *written* manifestation. After all, especially still from the formation of the first gospel until the finalisation of the last one as well, the tradition has supposedly been fluid, i.e. in continual transformation and re-formation. With regards to the essence of the gospels, does this approach exist with justification

a) Development in the miracle-tradition?

Let us assume that a development of the "historical core" of the tradition in the direction of an ever stronger pasting over with legends had indeed occurred, then the *miracle reports* should offer the best examination material to establish such dynamics. Surely, in the realm of miracles, the legend will sprout and thrive most amply. Nobody will assume that the influence of the community legend should have perhaps transpired in the direction of something miraculous gradually de-miraculising, diminishing or weakening. After all, the legend does not want to destroy itself, but it shows the desire to *enhance* the "everyday historical" events ever more into the miraculous. However, it could for example also be viewed as an enhancement that as an effective momentum of affirmation, a certain name or location is added to the (previously invented) miracle deeds. Now, what have the critical dynamicans established in that regard? *Felder* offers a good overview of the results so far: "*By the way, it almost comes across as comical, when we confront the opponents with each other regarding this point »enhancement of the miraculous«*". *Strauss* has the synoptical gospels in the chronological order Matthew - Luke - Mark, and according to this, the

enhancement is intensifying from Matthew to Luke, and from Luke to Mark. O Holtzmann and most of the modern researchers place Mark first, followed by Luke and finally Matthew; and now, the legendary enhancement is proceeding from Mark to Luke and from Luke to Matthew. Then again, still other critics come along and declare that of all synoptical gospels, "*Mark's is the most miraculous, and it is not surpassed in miraculousness even by John, the acknowledged youngest.*"²²⁴ G Naumann finally writes: "*In the miracle reports available to us, an enhancement cannot be established.*" Naumann hits the nail right on the head. Namely, quite obviously, a momentum of development is *arbitrarily projected into* the tales by the dynamicans (albeit more or less subconsciously). This entire talk of an enhancement of the miraculous is basically nonsensical, because each real miracle is, as a miracle per se, most high, and is not capable of "enhancement". (If in Mark, Jesus conjures the wind to calm, then this miracle is just as miraculous as in John, when Jesus resurrects someone who is dead.) And if we want to view an enhancement in an allegedly subsequent decorative "affirmation" of the miracle report by invented additional details (names of persons or locations), then we may sure try: [but] such attempt will fail miserably, because in this regard as well, the factual findings do not offer any proof for this thesis. In their parallel tellings, the allegedly later gospels by no means always know or report more concrete details than the earlier ones. For example, of what do the changes consist which Luke has carried out on Mark's calming of the storm? Of *omissions* of concrete details, of all things! Or: in Mark, Jairus' meeting with Jesus takes place in the open, Matthew transfers it indoors, and on top of it, the "later" Matthew has – *omitted* the affirming detail of the name! Luke then still has the special news that the child had been Jairus' only daughter. It will have become ever clearer to the reader that with this and similar synoptical reports, there can be no talk of enhancement or development, but that we are dealing with *deliberate variation* of the topic.

Now even an example, that the "later" legend has not perhaps enhanced the miracle, but diminished it. This is about Jesus' *transfiguration*. According to Mark, Jesus is transfigured "before the eyes" of the disciples, and that Eliah and Moses appear before them "in person". In just this way, things are unfolding with Matthew. With the "later" Luke however, the disciples are "in a deep sleep" during the onset of the transfiguration and apparition, and only when they had fully awoken (after the act of transformation), they saw his "glory" and the "two men". The example of the healing of the blind one is also educational. Mark knows the name of the blind one and reports that the healing had occurred on leaving the town of Jericho. Luke completely "suppresses" the "affirming" name and reports that the miracle deed had occurred when Jesus was approaching Jericho, i.e. before entering the town. Matthew on the other hand reports the healing of two blind persons without giving names or location of the event. And of all people, the "last" evangelist John fancies himself in diminishing the synoptical healing-of-the-blind-miracle, since he has Jesus behave like an ordinary miracle doctor by having him spread a pap of soil and saliva over the eye of the blind one. – Yet, has not the fourth evangelist strongly enhanced the miracle of the son of the Captain of Capernaum by reporting that Jesus had healed the sick one *from afar*, while according to the synoptists, the healing occurs *in the place itself*? However, such tele-healing is not at all an enhancement specialty of John, because even the "early" Mark (7,29) already has such a miracle by tele-healing! Only the stout theological dynamican will talk of enhancement or development in such cases, because they remain caught in the inherited presumption that the overall gospels must have, it goes without saying, undergone a natural development process.

b) Development of the idea of the creation and the character of the nature of "the Empire of God"?

According to the gospel reports, who has brought about, created, realised the "Empire of God"? Who has broken Satan's power, and just by that made the Empire possible in the first place – Godfather himself or God's son Jesus? What actually has Jesus *himself* thought and taught about this dogmatically not unimportant point? To find this out, *R Otto* looks at the beelzebub scene in Luke as well as the parallel places with Mark and Matthew. According to Luke 11,20, Jesus speaks on God's kingdom with the statement: *surely the Kingdom of God has (already) come upon you*. Matthew has the master speak likewise, while in Mark, the word (*surely the Kingdom of God has come upon you*) is missing. *Otto* summarises the result of his critical comparison as follows: "*We find meaning and logic of his response to the beelzebub accusation most clearly in Luke's report.*" According to *Otto*, Jesus wants to say to his opponents in Luke: "*Admit, that I cast out with God's finger. But if this is so, then it follows what I teach, that the Kingdom of God has already been realised, and that Satan has been robbed of his powers, since else, it would not be possible to take his booty, the obsessed ones, away from him...*"²²⁵ In the "original" tradition – or so *Otto* concludes – the idea prevails that God himself has (already previously) fought the actual, decisive victory over Satan – not Jesus! For this interpretation, *Otto* can reference Luke 10,18, where it of course also says that Jesus "saw" (not: effected himself) Satan fall like lightning from heaven. On this, our critic surprisedly remarks: "[It is] *almost a miracle that such word could even be preserved at all. Because it contradicts all later christology* [christology: dogmatic complex of ideas on the nature, the origin, the task and divine position of Christ-Jesus; K.] *But just this fact proves... that we... are standing on most firm jesuanical^{LVI} primeval ground.*" *Otto* wants to say: Jesus' "historical" view had been the idea that God himself had been the victor

LVI In all of the sources at my disposal, there was no such word as "jesuanisch" (orig.) or "jesuanical" (my translation) to be found. I have no idea what *Otto* is trying to say with that word. Sorry.

over Satan; only the late purpose legend has supposedly foisted this view on Jesus, he (Jesus himself) has supposedly considered himself and passed himself off for the victor over Satan. It is almost a miracle that the evangelist Luke, instead of simply omitting it, has handed down Jesus' "genuine" view of the creation of the Empire of God (or Satan's destruction, respectively) in the first place, which has actually been obsolete and rendered inappropriate by the "later dogmatic development" in christology. *"To me, the peculiar vagueness looming over the reports of Matthew and also Mark seems to clearly be connected with the fact" – or so Otto reckons – "that from the viewpoint of the later community, this tale was no longer intelligible. Dogmatically, they took it for granted that Christ himself had fought the actual victory over Satan, which is not at all Jesus' opinion, and which is also not yet meant in Luke, either."*

Is herewith not the striking proof being delivered that the tradition was indeed progressing in *dynamic movement*? By no means! It is immediately alienating that of all people, the "later" Luke represents the "obsolete, genuine" viewpoint. Versed researchers will object: the later Luke himself no longer represents this earlier viewpoint, but he has merely acted as a conscientious historian when he decided to carry over this "original" view (of Jesus) on the Empire of God in his work unchallenged. This attempt at an explanation has it shine right through just how clueless these critics are bypassing the actual issue. The presented problem is of a religious-psychological nature, and it is this: is it even possible that a primeval Christian (namely the evangelist Luke) could deliberately deny his (and his co-Christians') dogmatic conviction on one important point, just because an allegedly "original" tradition fell into his hands, which reported differently on the point in question? We are to consider that after all, this "original" author, according to prevailing opinion, had supposedly been breathing in the midst of the thick of the legend atmosphere, i.e. in times during which the "historical core" of the Jesus tradition had allegedly already been hopelessly overgrown

by the noble fungus of the legend, in times when it could allegedly no longer be established at all e.g. where Jesus had "really" been born and for how long he had been working publically. So, Luke has not been able to ignore an allegedly original tradition regarding the Empire of God out of pure "objectivity", out of pure researcher's conscientiousness? Although his co-citizens and he himself were living under the dogmatically-taken-for-granted conviction that *Jesus himself* had destroyed Satan's power and brought upon the Empire? We could only believe in such objectivity, if Luke were to simply prove to be an objective historian else as well. Let us have a closer look at this "primeval Christian", who is soulfully calmly flinging objective facts into the faces of his subjective co-believers.

J Weiss has already been dumbfounded over Luke's mysterious objectivity. The dogmatically highly significant word of Mark (10,45) on the meaning of the Son of Man's devoting his life as a "*ransom for many*" is *not* related by Luke, although he must have read this bit in his Mark-source (according to the two-sources theory supported by both *Weiss* and *Otto*). "*How is this to be understood?*", *Weiss* asks. "*Coincidence can be ruled out, because we make the very same observation in another important place – the Lord's supper words! Luke's demeanour belongs to the most mysterious phenomena in our sources*", *Weiss* concludes his review. Incredible, *how subjective* this objective man can be. Another example: the reader will remember that the text of the Lord's prayer in Luke – via the "old" handwritings – is handed down in two versions, that is, in Luke's text in Codex B, contains only five requests! There is for example the third request ("*thy will be done*") missing. (This has been dealt with more thoroughly in Part 1.) Since this abridgement cannot possibly be associated with a copyist, Luke himself must have shortened the Lord's prayer by two requests. Luke cannot offer any more stark proof of his subjectivity. Now, the subjectivity of the objective Luke is also surfacing especially in the treatment of the issue which interests us the most in this here section, namely the Empire-of-God issue. In still other places of his

gospel, Luke has concerned himself with Jesus' "original" opinion on the Empire of God. In Luke 9,27, Jesus says: The Empire of God *is still to come*, it is on our doorstep, this generation will still experience it. In Luke 11,20 (our starting point) on the other hand, it goes, as we heard before: *the Empire of God has* [already; K.] *come upon you*. And lo and behold, in Luke 17,20, both statements are mixed by Jesus answering the question; when will the Empire of God come? once replies: "*The Empire of God does not come* [i.e. as a future prospect; K.]... *so that*", and then carries on: "... *the Empire of God is* [now already; K.] *within you*." – Here, we see Luke as the most skilful tactician of the threefold variation, i.e. with this discovery, we lightning-like realise that here, no "primeval Christian" as "objective subjectivist" has been writing history at all, but that here – as in the gospels as such – we are dealing with the result betraying the big falsification action. There can be no mention of a natural development in the dogmatic idea of the Empire of God; simply because of the fact that the alleged driving force of the entire "primevally christian" development process: the community legend, remains merely the phantom of liberal-theological researchers. But why then have the medieval gospel fictionists not agreed upon what [words] they would put into Jesus' mouth regarding the Empire of God? *They have agreed*, that is, namely upon the fact that Jesus *were not to be permitted to proclaim anything unique about the "Empire"*. On the one hand, they had it clear that the Empire of God had "already arrived" and was there. On the other hand however, there was an important dogmatic reason why to have the Empire arrive *only after* Jesus' death (more accurately: *via Jesus' death!*) so that they had to have Jesus talk of the Empire of God as a future prospect. The reader will find more detailed information on this deliberate contradiction in Chapter 4.

c) Development of the idea of the person Jesus?

During the course of the 19th century, the problem which we will now place at the centre of the investigation has gained a significance like barely any other modern theological question

of profession and conscience. Formulated for the first time in full acuteness by rationalism, this since called *christological problem* represents the deep divide separating the orthodox and liberal theology from each other. What *is* the christological problem? It raises *the question of the nature and salvation-related significance of Jesus' personality* (as Christ) for the Christ-belief. For a Christian, what role does *the person Jesus* of Nazareth play? What significance did Jesus himself attribute to himself, or, more clearly still: in the framework of his proclamation, did he attribute *any religious significance* to himself at all? As is well-known, the liberal theologians reply: no! Jesus felt to be merely the mouthpiece and proclaimer of the divine word revealed to him, has viewed himself to be merely the prophet, the leader of humanity towards salvation, and did not attribute to his person any relationship or essential significance for the process of that salvation. The reply of the orthodox sounds completely different: salvation is not only linked to the proclamation, but also to the person Jesus as the "divine" Christ. *The path to salvation leads through the "divine" person Jesus!* According to this view, Jesus of Nazareth is no mere prophet or teacher, but as a person, he is the redeemer and saviour of mankind, and he himself has pointed out this salvation significance.

We start this critical observation with Mark's gospel, and, since we are not layer-addicted, we take this script for what it poses to be: a uniform whole entity. *What does Mark think of the person Jesus?* Does he attribute any significance to it at all? Right away in the introduction, Mark utters his basic conviction, that Jesus of Nazareth be the "son of God". If in this place, we want to consider the words "son of God" for "not original" (inserted later), because they are missing from the "old" script S, then this does not mean that the fact is challenged that in many other places, the evangelist's view of the divinity of the person Jesus is not put in doubt whatsoever. It is very important that the author does not present the belief of Jesus being God's son as his personal opinion, but that he indicates that *Jesus himself* had

made such high divine claim for himself. In the story of the healing of the paralytic (Mark 2,5), we find "proof" of how strongly Jesus himself had thought of the nature and significance of his person. Here, Jesus, fully conscious of his divine dignity, exercises the divine privilege of forgiving sins. Certainly, he does not yet openly announce it that he is the son of God; however, he who assumes the privilege of God (the forgiving of the sins) as he does here – to those who have ears to hear – is more than clearly hinting at just what the deal is with his person. Modestly, he gives himself the assumed name "son of Man", like a King would call himself the "first servant of the state", and he forbids the "demonic ones" who know of his divine station to openly cry out about their secret knowledge in the marketplace. Note well: he forbids them revealing the secret, but he by no means scolds them for being wrong in their view. He even threatens his disciples to not tell anybody about his divine dignity (Mark 8,30); but he does also not explain to them that they are erring in their belief that he is the Christ. As the "son of Man", he will also come in the glory of his father (God) with the holy angels, after he has given his life as a "ransom for many" (Mark 10,45).

The picture which Mark is sketching of Jesus here – which Jesus is sketching of himself – can *not in any way be enhanced any further in its divine sheen*; because the main focus is just the fact that this human being from Nazareth is viewing himself "indeed" as the son of God, whilst this or that specific detail of being God's son is of no importance. In the face of such places in Mark, how can the liberal researchers cling to their assertion that for his person, Jesus did *not* claim divine dignity and redeeming salvation significance? Because they hold in their hands alleged proof that words such as of the ransom and the claim regarding his being the son of God are "not genuine", namely that they have been created and foisted in by the later community dogma. And of what nature is this proof? We know it more than sufficiently: it is the famous *proof by layer-separation*! By this patent method, all offensive dogmatic parts of the Mark gospel indeed turn out to be inserted. After we have, in

earlier places, regularly recognised intuition and arbitrariness as the effective reagents of all of these separation procedures, we may as well save ourselves any further words on the separation proof of these researchers.

The orthodox researchers are thus rightfully protesting against such attempts at separating a legendary portion of the overall gospels sprung from dogmatic animosity. Does this mean – or so some readers will ask now – that according to this, the orthodox are right when they claim that Jesus himself had linked salvation to his person as the redeemer? Indeed: *literarily*, they are right, because the places in which Jesus is uttering such words simply cannot be violently cut out with the liberal scissors. Literarily, the word of the ransom is established, and it stands there rocksolid in the Mark gospel, and it is of no use at all to the theologist *Wernle* for example, when he is wrestling and writhing: "*As soon as I want to build my view of the salvation significance of Jesus' death upon the word of the ransom in Mark, I am plagued with the greatest of objections over how it might be possible that this loose little appendix to a totally differently aligned word of God should carry such heavy things.*"²²⁶ If someone wants to accept only words of God with a tight, flawless logic, then they may as well strike off as not genuine almost all sentence structures that have been put in Jesus' mouth, that is, in all four gospels.

The modern science of liberal theology has still other explanations at the ready in order to ban the offensive dogma of Jesus being the son of God from the gospels. Thus, in the consciousness of the disciples, the "original" idea of Jesus as the son of God was merely "meant" to be a purely ethical-religious one. The expression *son of God* is meant to represent the impression which *the religious personality of the human being Jesus* has made upon his first followers! But even in the synoptical gospels, there is nothing to be found of such platonic view, of such "metaphorical" son-of-God-ness. If Mark has Peter utter the confession: you are Christ!, then the evangelist is unmistakably hinting at us that this disciple,

much like him, the author himself, has taken the expression "Christ" in some way *literally*, but in no way metaphorically. Even that Jesus himself has supposedly perceived the secret of his being the son of God as the "feeling" of the most intimate communion with the heavenly father, is a claim which is repugnant to the christological basic stance on the synoptists. An ethical-religious son-of-God-ness, the way it has been "felt" by all pious people in a metaphorical sense, Jesus truly did not have to hide as a deep secret from the eyes of the world. To top it off, the evangelists carefully differentiate in the way they have Jesus talk of God, the father: he always says "my" father and "your" father, but never "our" father! According to the view of all evangelists, his relation to God the Father is something very special, and essentially not comparable to the position of the disciples (and other people).

During the discussion on the christological height of the Mark gospel, it has already been recognised that in the simple-brief statement: "*this Jesus is the son of God*", the whole world of the christological secret is comprised. *A development, or enhancement respectively, of the innermost nature's significance is no longer even conceivable and possible.* Merely one other thing is possible: the (in the simple statement condensed) abundance of the basic christological idea can be spread out, its individual parts placed next to each other, i.e. the "historical" depiction of the idea can be dealt with statically. In the case of a static design of the overall gospels, one precondition would have to hold true: all gospels would have to be created not successively, but they must have been created simultaneously and uniformly as the result of one event. In that case, the *individual parts* of the mentally split christological basic idea would have to be *planfully distributed over the different gospels*. Does this assumption prove valid? Our dynamicans will be swift in referencing the "last" gospel as counter-proof, and declare: how can one even doubt the gradual development of the christological dogma, when it is established that only the latest evangelist talks of Jesus as the *pre-existing logos*. In order to understand what is meant by the expression "pre-existing

logos", we present here the introductory sentences of John's gospel: "*In the beginning was the logos* [– the word, the thought, the power of reason –; K.] *and the logos was with God, and the logos was God... And the logos became flesh...*"^{LVII} So, in John's "primevally christian" sense, the logos is a since time immemorial with God existing (God-equivalent, God-like) being whose secret is realising in the "word". And this "word" has (in the person Jesus) become flesh, i.e. a human being. The logos is called pre-existing, because it had been with God long before becoming flesh, even before the creation of the world.

Indeed, the synoptical gospels know nothing yet of the pre-existing logos having become flesh in the person of Jesus; only through John do we find out about this special kind of metaphysical son-of-God-ness. So, a development has taken place? If it were really possible and permissible to talk of a mental development or enhancement, respectively, it would have to be proven that the thought of the pre-existence *had not yet occurred* to the "primeval Christians" or to the synoptical evangelists, respectively, or that it has at least not been uttered by them; only the fourth evangelist must have invented the thought of pre-existence.

One thing is clear and certain: in the moment in time in which the powerful secret – this human being is the son of God, that is, he really is, and literally! – had been revealed to the "primeval Christians" by Jesus himself, from that moment on, amazement and contemplation must have been aroused. A corporeal human being who at the same time is a divine being: how can this be? But to be of a divine nature means: to be *of divine origin, of divine provenance*. Whoever even contemplated this riddle at all, was soon automatically faced with several "possibilities" which would render the act of uniting the human and the divine in Jesus "intelligible" to them. Amongst these possibilities, two in particular are

LVII KJ consistently shows "word" instead of "logos", in case you are wondering, dear reader. This was necessary in order to accurately follow Kammeier's line of thought. After all, the "original" was supposedly written in Greek.

forcing themselves. Firstly: the *living human being* Jesus has been "transformed" into, or connected with, respectively, the son of God simultaneously with his birth, or at a later time in his life. Secondly: by the birth from within Mary, the since ages with God resting *logos* took on flesh, and thus became (simultaneously) a corporeal human being. Now, did the first Christians (and evangelists) already "really" consider such thoughts? The gospels should give us the proof. Let us see how things stand with this.

In their parallel reports of *Jesus' baptism*, among others, the synoptists are perhaps indirectly, but nonetheless unmistakably hinting at having indeed been intensely contemplating the christological problem by relating an apparition (of the holy ghost in form of a dove) and a voice from heaven ("this is my beloved son"). That is, it turns out that they are somehow representatives of the above sketched *first* idea. However, could it be that they have *not even noticed the second* possibility of the solution to the problem? This is most unlikely. After all, once the christological problem had become acute, then the different options of the rendering-intelligible would have to turn up quite by themselves. Consider the following: the synoptists are expressing that by the mysterious ongoing in a baptism, a human being (Jesus) is becoming the son of God. In this, was the "reversed" thought, that the (already pre-existing) son of God (*logos*) has become a human being in Jesus, so far out? On the contrary. Once again assuming that Jesus and the primeval Christians per se are supposedly personalities of history, then especially the idea of a God-turned-human-being (as a constituent of the pagan environment religion) would have been familiar to the first followers of the messiah. That *a God descended* (and became a human being), had to be at least an equally familiar idea as the reversed one – that *a human being has been elevated to be the son of God*. Concealed hints now reveal that the synoptists as well have indeed already been familiar with the "later" solution to the problem by John. This is about the places in Mark 1,38 and Luke 4,43. Here, Jesus is reported uttering: "... *because for this purpose* [to

preach; K.] *I have come forth...*" or "*for this purpose, I have been sent...*", respectively; and these peculiar, solemn expressions (in this context) are indicating that the thought of "*the into the world sent son of God*" was known even to the "older" evangelists. This by the way also clearly follows from Matthew's and Luke's tales of the wonderful conception and especially of the wonderful birth of the "redeemer". Because here, the dogmatic idea is prevelant that the human being Jesus has been chosen to be the son of God not only via the baptism, but that in Bethlehem already, Mary had given birth to a divine son, i.e. that something divine (the son of God) has taken the mysterious passage through her body on the way from heaven to Earth.

So, had the synoptists already known of this second christological problem solution – then why have they, that is, all three synoptists – *suppressed* this knowledge so violently? How is it explained that *all three* synoptists, who else so carelessly re-knead the "original" tradition to their purposes (community purposes), agree in almost totally silencing to death a certain very obvious idea in christology? This *agreement* is becoming an unsolvable mystery, if we further take into consideration that the "first" three evangelists have *not* been *acquainted with each other*, and each set to work independent of their colleagues. This agreement cannot be explained by natural means; only this one way out remains: that here, too, we are presented an artificially generated phenomenon, which becomes intelligible immediately if we view it as tactics of the learned planning. In the council of the forgers, it has been decided *to distribute the two main solutions of the christological problem complex in the overall gospels so*, that the synoptists should most prominently highlight the one side, but John the other. Thus, the ideas of Jesus being the son of God have not developed gradually, neither have they successively taken turns, but: the synoptical as well as the Johnian special view of the *one* christological basic idea have been *conceived simultaneously and planfully set out from the beginning*. However, there can also be no talk of any inner

dynamic; not perhaps because John (i.e. the forgery commission) more closely characterises the pre-existing son of God as the logos (the word), because with this, he has not gained any new aspect to the nature of the basic idea, but merely attached to it an elsewhere picked up philosophical tag in order to make some fair weather with the philosophers.

A comparison of the *different versions of the story of the baptism with the synoptists and John* generates the ultimate proof for the systematic fabrication, especially for the static character of the evangelical christology. Namely, even with the for the christological problem complex so enormously important tales of Jesus' baptism, the telling tactics of the threefold (why, fourfold) variation can be demonstrated. This is about the "historical" details, who of the involved persons had seen the holy spirit descending in the form of a dove, and who had heard the all the while audible voice of God. In Matthew, only Jesus sees the spirit, but the voice is not directed towards him, but towards the others. In Luke, it is the other way around: Jesus hears the voice, and the in "corporeal form" descending holy spirit is seen by the bystanders. Mark modifies both reports so, that Jesus sees the spirit as well as hears the voice himself. And John varies once again by relating that it had been the baptist who hears the voice and sees the spirit descending. – It does not require one further word that here, much like in the earlier listed examples of the threefold variation, no coincidence, and equally as little "natural" development had been at work, but that a deliberate concept, static construction work, becomes visible.

It has thus been recognised as the character of the nature of the entire gospels' essence: *not natural dynamics, but artificially generated statics*. These everywhere surfacing internally artful statics leave no doubt about the fact that the gospel mountain is no naturally grown history-rock, but that we stand before an artificially accumulated compost heap of fiction. This does not perhaps mean that this heap of art is composed of fiction and history, but it means: no history at all, but fiction through and through. Therefore, in the theological

fraternal fight over the dogmatic statements in the gospels, neither the liberals nor the orthodox are right. The orthodox side are literarily and relatively in the right on the one hand, because the liberal splitting of the gospels into "historical core" and legendary hull becomes only ever possible by the application of intuition and arbitrariness; but on the other hand, factually and absolutely, the orthodox are also wrong, since after all, the critics' ultimate conclusion does *not* read: no legendary hull, and therefore all historical core, *but*: no history at all, therefore all hull and fiction.

III. The deliberate contradiction in the gospels as testimony to their uniform origin

The nature of the deliberate contradiction lies in the *consciously constructed discrepancy* of the falsified (fictionalised) history. In the first book of my works already, the readers have been acquainted with the deliberate contradiction as the most primevally genuine, *very most applied conceptional tactics* of the systematic history falsification action of the late Middle Ages. And **not only in the realm of profane history, but also in the framework of the evangelical history of the NT, we have so far bumped into open or concealed signs of this popular and cunning method of forgery.**^{LVIII} In the first Book of this here volume, the existence of *two planes of contradiction equally standing perpendicular to each other* have been pointed out: firstly, the vertical plane of the deliberate contradiction within each gospel, as they *successively* surface in the handwritings as so-called variations, and secondly, the horizontal plane of the deliberate contradictions, the way such are met in the gospels, when

LVIII Highlighted by yours truly: this giant of a statement more than indicates that the originators of both the universal history falsification action and the Bible are identical.

viewed *next to each other*. In Parts 2 and 3 already, and equally in this here Part 4, we have abundantly met examples of this second group. A special reminder shall be given here of the educational modification of these tactics in the form of the threefold variation. In this here chapter as well as in the following one, we take the opportunity to report in more detail on *forms, the nature and origin of the deliberate contradiction* within the gospels by listing plentiful new evidence in this context.

There is the thinnest line going through the overall mass of the gospel as the history of Jesus' life and work, cutting the whole thing and all its individual parts up into *two mutually contradicting halves of the presentation*. Each fact breaks up into at least two parts which cannot be uniquely joined together however, but which repel and exclude each other. (That the split-up of the facts can also oftentimes be a three- or fourfold one is rooted in the fact of the existence of four sub-gospels.) Thus, the two parts do not perhaps stand for "halves" of the one fact, but the parts each represent the one, indivisible fact in two forms, in two colourations, in two kinds of presentation, which cancel each other out. And more than anything: the deliberate contradiction, as its nature is expressing, is no coincidentally resulting phenomenon, but much rather, it takes effect a priori as purposefully applied tactics of the dramaturgical design.

Forms and examples of the deliberate contradiction

First, we take each gospel as a whole, and carry out an overall comparison. What is the result? If we inquire with the orthodox, they tell us that the comparative examination of the gospels supposedly shows a harmonic entanglement, a flowing together of all individual facts into an enormous harmonic entity. Regardless of how different in nature the contents of the individual gospels may be, these [Comedian?!] harmonists explain, everything – assuming

the "correct observation" of the critic – is eventually most formidably fitting in to form a well-rounded whole. There could be no talk of contradiction at all! The gospels were to be viewed as members of an organism. Thus, e.g. *J Grimm* is uttering: "*Depending on the viewpoint of the individual evangelist, the one characteristic trait, the one integrating member of the rich organism immediately jumps out..., each part points... towards the other... parts, one has the other as a condition, as a prerequisite... Thus, the four gospels indeed form desired supplements among each other.*"²²⁷ Superficially viewed, *Grimm* is not quite wrong. His observation, that one gospel is assuming one (or all, respectively) other, and has it as a prerequisite, is even correct, and this is also confirmed by other researchers; but this fact of the gospels being mutually tuned represents at the same time a by *Grimm* not observed dangerous critique-cliff for the thesis of the naturally formed gospel harmony. In order to see this cliff, we have to merely remember, that according to time-honoured view, the gospels have supposedly been created successively and as independent works of different authors – but then, whence the striking phenomenon that one gospel *assumes* another (or all others)? *Whence the peculiar mutually being-tuned then?* We could still perhaps accept of the "last" evangelist, that he supposedly had the scripts of his three predecessors before him, and aligned his gospel with them. Now, that the three synoptists could have achieved a harmonic alignment "by chance" – probably only a strongly faithful harmonist could assume this; because how are we to explain the synoptical harmony as having naturally formed? As is well-known, those researchers who bless us with their fabulous "solutions" to this synoptical question retort: nothing simpler than this! Too bad however, that no solution was any good, not even the famous two-sources theory! And that the by *Grimm* observed mutual consideration of the gospels for each other can thus not be rendered intelligible as a natural (i.e. "primevally christian") phenomenon, either. Alas, an explanation must be sought and found, and for the reader of course, it [the explanation] is plain to see, too. The in the

"primevally christian" situation not as natural explicable phenomenon, that the four gospel scripts mutually cause and assume each other, finds a perfect understanding as the *planful result of a late medieval action* on the part of a learned forgers' association.

1. Of the many examples of how carefully all gospels are aligned with each other, we first list: the *systematic shift of the event location of Jesus workings*. In *Matthew*, everything important unfolds in *Galilaea* (with Capernaum as the centre). *Mark* may perhaps have still many ongoing take place in *Galilaea* as well – with *Mark* and *Matthew*, even the scribes have to travel from *Jerusalem* to *Galilaea* in order to function as personnel of the action – but according to *Mark*, a good deal already unfolds during *travelling* which *Jesus* is undertaking, and once even towards the North around *Tyre* and *Caesarea Philippi*, and then towards the South (to *Jerusalem*). *Luke* is even transferring the bulk of his narrative to the times of wandering. In this, some reports do not at all match the supposed travel situation. With *Luke* as well as with *John*, *Capernaum* is quite cut down. With *John*, the transfer of the event locations has been taken another step further: in the fourth gospel, *Jesus* teaches the most, and the most important things, *in Jerusalem*! In *Luke* (and *John*) by the way, the journey goes through *Samaria*, while in *Matthew* and *Mark*, *Jesus* is wandering through *Perea*. We thus notice a planful shift of the event location: *Galilaea* – *Galilaea* and travels – walk to *Jerusalem* – *Judaea* (*Jerusalem*). Some researchers have long realised that *this constitutes artificial fabrication*. *J Schmid* for example judges the so-called *Lukanian travel report*: "*It cannot be doubted that the Lukanian travel report... is not arranged geographically, that it much rather is no travel report at all, but quite a loose, in part by catchwords connected supplement to the narrative of Mark.*"²²⁸ Looking at this travel report a little more closely, the details of the travel route turn out to be generic topographic descriptions (e.g. "*he came into a village*" – "*he taught in a synagogue*" – "*he went to the house of one of the leaders of the Pharisees*"). "*The idea of the location is quite unclear. After what has been described*

previously, *Jesus is in Samaria already, then he is in Galilaea again... and then it says: »He wandered straight through Samaria and Galilaea.«* Where actually are we now? »Straight through Samaria and Galilaea« rather indicates a journey to the North rather than the South (Jerusalem)."²²⁹ All in all, with this peculiar shift of the event locations, we are dealing quite obviously with a planful design, a systematic variation of topographical details, that is, at the end of the day, with a deliberate fourfold geographical contradiction.

2. The following example grants a deep look into the secret of the evangelical variation and construction. In chapter 10, 42-45, *Mark* delivers the well-known words of serving and being served, that is, on the occasion of Jesus rejecting John's and Jacob's request for heavenly places of honour. It is now not so important that *Matthew* 20, 20-28 alters the scene to the effect that with him, not the two named disciples themselves, but their mother is putting forward the requests for her sons. However, it is significant in which way *Luke* proceeds. He delivers something quite striking: he completely *cuts the words* of the serving *out of their context* in *Mark* and *Matthew*, and makes them part of Jesus' speech at the *Lord's supper*! Naturally, with this operation, the "primevally christian" author must have had something in mind. How does such word re-rooting even occur to him? Can we believe it? *Luke* has had premonitions! He anticipated that at some time, his "successor", namely the last evangelist *John*, could make good use of these words in a different context, and so he wanted to do some prep-work for him! The reader will momentarily notice, how this is to be understood. *Luke* does not only re-position the relevant words, he also modifies them in a peculiar fashion by aligning them to the situation of the meal: "*For who is greater, he who sits at the table, or he who serves?*" So, not as a teacher or miracle workers does Jesus want to serve here, but as a "servant at the table". However, *Luke* does not reveal in what way the master serves or wants to serve at the table. The whole thing is mysterious, but most mysterious remains what could have caused *Luke* in the first place to rip Jesus' saying about

serving out of its "original" context and smuggle it into the supper speech, of all places. Like I said, this evangelist must have been a clairvoyant! He must have anticipated that his successor John would omit the "actual" Lord's supper scene, and would instead deliver one in which Jesus would indeed at the table, like a servant, wash his disciples' feet. The reader may well object that it is yet easily understandable that *John* had been equally illustrating Luke's suggestion of the "serving at the table" by his tale of the foot-washing at the table [Eek! Not really – it's revolting! – at the *table!*]; but with this, they [the reader] show that they have not realised where the problem lies; because the big mystery is and remains the following: just what is driving *Luke* to so "subconsciously" do prep-work for John by such utterly unmotivated violent imputation of firmly in the "original" context inserted sayings by Jesus? We have no cause to believe in such anticipating prep-work of the "primeval Christian" Luke. We thus judge this dark affair as yet more evidence for the systematic-uniform origin of the gospels.

3. The *contradiction regarding the chronology of the day of the Lord's supper and the day of Jesus' death* has been carried out deliberately. The reports on the last supper which Jesus held with his disciples offer a stark contradiction regarding the chronology of the day of the Lord's supper. On which day of the week of suffering did Jesus have his last meal with his own [company]? The new-testamentarian critics have wasted rivers of ink over the solution to this question without reaching a positive result. How do things stand again in a literary regard? According to the explicit assurance of the synoptists, the institution of the Lord's supper took place during the course of a by Jesus held Jewish *passover celebration*, i.e. on the for this prescribed evening of the 14th of Nisan. According to this, Jesus' sentencing and execution would have taken place on the following day (15th of Nisan). Even the "historian" among the evangelists, Luke, who has of course carefully investigated the "real" course of events, confirms these details. But now the fourth evangelists shows up, mixes things up a

little and makes for a considerable surprise. Once again, he knows it all better than his colleagues, and reports completely calm and with innermost conviction that the meal – which according to him was no passover meal at all, but an ordinary one – had not taken place on the 14th, but already on the 13th of Nisan. So, John contradicts the three synoptists, because – it goes without saying – only *one* date can be true and correct for the "historical" fact of the last supper. To this, some orthodox researchers say: certainly!, and then set out to inform us that despite the deviating detail of which day it was, there actually exists no contradiction at all, because "most likely", things back then have been thus: in that particular year, there was no agreement over the day of the passover slaughter between the Pharisees and one party of priests [sounds just like science to me]. For the one party, this ceremony fell on one day later than for the other. Now, while John stuck with the day of priests' party in this passover affair, the synoptists have handed down the other date as the day of the meal. In this fashion, the deviation between the details with John on the one hand, and the synoptists on the other, is thus quite naturally and simply explained. The zealous inventors of this explanation however – as can be highlighted admirably – have found little favour even amongst the circle of their co-researchers. *"Two insurmountable difficulties have not been taken into consideration in this", G Dalman remarks, "firstly, according to the law, passover is attached to a certain calendar day, and cannot be moved arbitrarily..., Secondly, it is primarily unproven and improbable on the face of it, that indeed ever, the passover has been slaughtered and sacrificed on two successive days in the sanctuary."*²³⁰ And *W Bauer*, in a review of *H Strack's* and *P Billerbeck's* work, "Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch", Vol. 2, expresses himself as follows: *"The excursus over Jesus' day of death with the result that both the synoptists with their 15th Nisan and John with the 14th are correct, is simply impermissible and only intelligible out of the principle... it must be possible to find a*

solution..."²³¹ Certainly, for the theologists of the positive direction, it must be possible to find a solution, no matter how wondrous it may be.

Many consider the synoptists' detail "historical", and reject John's date and description as dogmatic falsification: supposedly, the fourth evangelist did not want to have the last supper appear *as a Jewish* passover meal. As if in real life of the primeval Christians, the "last" evangelist could have even dared and gotten away with this, declaring the all-known and sanctioned "historical" detail of all synoptists to be wrong! But let us turn our critical eye away from John, and towards the synoptists. There, we must soon realise that the synoptists' chronology is subject to most severe doubts as well. Numerous researchers have thus also decidedly rejected the synoptical dates, and their objections are indeed grave. They rightfully point out that it is supposedly quite improbable that the Jewish authorities had, as the synoptical details have us believe, desecrated the big passover celebration day by court sessions and negotiations before Pilate. However, *one* side must be right!, the so helplessly cornered theologists protest. "*The question can only be, on whose side the law of history stands...*", the above mentioned *W Bauer* asserts. And with the following explanation, he insists that despite the mentioned difficulties, the synoptists are supposedly right: "*Then what do the [against the synoptists; K.] raised objections want to signify in the face of the impossibility to render the origin of the synoptical narrative intelligible, when in reality, the day was a different one?*"²³² This is it: it cannot be made intelligible at all, just how the synoptists – all three synoptists! – should have arrived at their wrong details. Indeed, there is nothing to be gained by way of a "natural" explanation. This however, is also showing us the way out of the dilemma: the presented contradiction is an artificial-learned one. Only this is still left to be asked: then why did the smart falsifiers not agree on one particular day?

The reason for the deliberately discrepant detail of which day it was can be found in the following consideration of the gospel inventors. The christian plan for salvation is built

upon the philosophical basic idea that Jesus as the redeemer gave his life as a "ransom for many", or in other words: that he, as the real passover sacrifice, as the true Easter lamb, performed his work of redemption. Now, since the meaning of the Lord's supper secret lies in just this idea of the passover sacrifice, the essential connection with the Jewish passover was the natural result, and this in a fashion that the new (christian) transformed the old (Jewish), soaked it up, replaced it. Therefore, in the synoptical reports, they [the falsifiers] had this internal causality and connection become visible and significant: through a relevant (christian) transformation of the celebration of the Jewish passover meal on the by law fixed day of the 14th of Nisan. On the other hand however, it was of utmost importance to the forgers' association to *not* have the christian Lord's supper celebration appear as something conditionally *Jewish*, not as a modified Jewish passover meal. If Jesus himself was meant to be the real passover lamb, any inner connection in the nature of the Lord's supper to the Jewish passover had to necessarily be eliminated. This is why John, as opposed to the synoptists, had to express that the last supper was no passover meal, and that "in reality", it was held already prior, on the 13th of Nisan. And in order to throw curious researchers of the "true state of affairs" completely into confusion, and so that nobody at all could force a natural-unique result, the popular misch-masch tactics was not to be missed: by occasional little hints, they had the synoptists testify against their own report and determination of the day! Thus, for example on the day of death which of course, according to their own statement was the high Jewish festive day, they had Simon come "from the fields", the women prepared pastes, i.e. all of a sudden, they pretended that the day of death had become a working day.

4. The reports of the evangelists on the final results in Jerusalem contain still further (open or concealed) deliberate contradictions. Chronologically, how do *the events around the crucifixion* unfold? Both Mark and Matthew relate these events in the following "historical" order: 1. Jesus' crucifixion; 2. sharing the clothes; 3. inscription on the cross; 4. crucifixion of

the thieves; 5. mockery of the priests; 6. abusing the thieves; 7. darkness; 8. soldier with vinegar; 9. Jesus' death; 10. ripping apart of the temple curtain. Luke is not satisfied with this order, he is grouping the events differently, namely so: 1, 4, 2, 5, 8, 3, 6, 7, 10, 9. And John varies once again: 1, 4, 3, 2, 8, 9. On the darkness and ripping the curtain, John remains silent altogether. Instead however, he can offer a new, remarkable "fact" of which the synoptists know nothing, of which not even the zealously inquiring Luke has heard of: that Jesus' mother was standing by the cross. There are enough theological critics who skip such differences as irrelevant, so that we want to laudably highlight what their colleague *P Wernle* wanted them to know: *"Why, the difficult differences are there without us creating or even enhancing them... That for example according to the three synoptists, Jesus' mother is not standing by the cross, whilst with John, especially she and the favourite brother are the main personnel, is simply a fact of the matter which is not being explained by saying: how wrong to notice it!"*²³³

In real life, it goes without saying, there would never have been any insecurity over the *hour of the crucifixion*, since this chronological fact as a well-known one of public record (and an official one) could not have sunk into oblivion within a few decades. Nonetheless, Mark on the one hand and John on the other, report differently on this important point. According to Mark, Jesus was nailed to the cross "around the third hour", according to John, "around the sixth hour". Again, some researchers have found out that basically, there is no contradiction at all. *P Feine* explains the difference away by claiming that John has supposedly counted the hour after the Roman, but Mark after the Jewish way of calculating.²³⁴ [These doubtlessly 'intelligent' people just have an answer for everything.] Unfortunately, *Feine* forgot to observe that else among the researchers, it says that Mark had written his gospel for the Pagan Christians, which could for example be proven by the fact

that he strikingly prefers the Roman types of currency.^{LIX} In the crucifixion report, he now suddenly denies his preference for everything Roman, and allegedly counts in the Jewish fashion. And again by the way, the way of denoting money with the synoptists proves the shared artificial-learned origin of the evangelists via the well-known tactics of the threefold variation. Thus, Mark "prefers" the Roman types of currency, Luke the Greek ones, and Matthew uses both, with an under-representation of the Roman ones however.²³⁵

By such trifles and seemingly irrelevant details, which are simply necessary in order to give a story the appearance of real life however, the deliberation and artificiality of the contradiction is revealing itself particularly clearly. From the large number of places of proof, let the following ones be picked out: Mark 6,8: prohibition of copper; Luke 9,3: prohibition of silver. Mark 6,5: Jesus was unable to perform miracles; Luke 4,16: he was unwilling to perform miracles. Matthew 4,11: the angels only appear after the tempter has left; Mark 1,13: the angels are serving Jesus for the entire forty days. Mark 6,12: the sent apostles are meant to preach atonement; Matthew 10,8: they are meant to heal the sick. Mark 14,18: prediction of the betrayal before the supper; Luke 22,21: prediction after the meal. Mark 4,8: seed bears fruit thirty, sixty and hundredfold; Matthew 13,8: reversed order; Luke 8,8: only hundredfold. Mark 15,21: Simon of Cyrenia carries the cross (same with Matthew and Luke); John 19,16: Jesus carries the cross himself.

5. In a *purely formal-stylistic and linguistic* regard, the deliberate contradiction within the overall gospels makes itself equally strikingly known. *W Larfeld* has compared the gospels with each other in terms of language and style; in doing so, he has come to the interesting result that the "later" evangelists Matthew and Luke had *deliberately differentiated* their source, namely the Mark text, in a linguistic-stylistic regard. May *Larfeld*

LIX I'm just glad we're approaching the end. I don't know about you, dear reader, but this here mortal one can't take much of this cleverdickery anymore.

not also represent our thesis of Jesus' un-historicity – he considers the gospels successively created scripts of "primevally christian" authors – his discovery that the "primeval Christians" Matthew and Luke had linguistically re-designed their Mark source out of a pure drive for differentiation, is nonetheless also quite a confirmation of our general thesis of the artificial fabrication (invention) of the overall gospels. So, let us have a closer look at the *Larfeldian* findings. We could now indeed find it conceivable that Matthew and Luke have formally smoothened their alleged source, the "*in a linguistic and stylistic regard on a less developed level standing*" Mark gospel, and have presented it to the Greek educated circle of readers in a more beautiful Greek attire. "*Matthew has often omitted the Latin Words of Mark, replaced or paraphrased with Greek expressions.*" "*Luke has reduced the Latin vocabulary of Mark still further or replaced them with Greek expressions.*"²³⁶ Like I said: we could find this procedure conceivable even with "primeval Christians", because in this way of course, the actual "historic" substance of the template would not have been altered. However, the alleged smoothing and improving of Mark's Greek by Matthew and Mark already hardly agrees with what *Larfelf* himself has to admit: that Luke, if albeit rarely, "*replaced good expressions of his predecessors by lesser ones.*"²³⁷ And what *J Schmid* is presenting, is equally incompatible with the alleged linguistic improvement and higher development. According to this, the "improvers" of the bad Greek of Mark, on their part, have a language on offer which carries "*a distinct Semitic flavour*". Even the third evangelist still writes plenty of Hebrewisms! So, this peculiar "improver" Luke who in the foreword of his gospel has indeed written a Hellenistically well-thought sentence by form and content, denies in the gospel itself his beautiful Greek style and deliberately debases it by Hebrewisation! But if we now still hear the following, it becomes clear as daylight that here, not "primeval Christians" have been at work, but that the late medieval gospel fictionists were having fun with their tactics of the deliberate contradiction and variations. "*...changes to the Mark text, where the later*

evangelists have nonetheless replaced expressions of their source, which they have evidently been familiar with, or which have even belonged to their preferred idioms."²³⁸ Mark for example uses one particular word 28 times. Matthew also otherwise loves especially this word; he uses it 16 times, 11 times of which independently of Mark. *"All the more it sticks out that Matthew shows it only 5 times in the parallel places to Mark, whilst in 19 places, he erases that word."* *"Luke's fancy for differentiation jumps out even more."*²³⁹ We establish as a result that the "primevally christian" authors have carried out changes to the "templates" "out of pure differentiation addiction", that is, even when there was no reason for any variation at all; purely out of fun over contradictions!

The theologists like to assess the Semitic flavour of the gospel Greek as an attribute of the "primevally christian" authenticity, i.e. as proof that the gospels had really in primevally christian times grown out of the tradition of Jesus' Semitic discipleship. This argument is dripping from naivety of "critical" thinking. It goes without saying of course, that the late medieval forgers who were no strawheads after all, have linguistically equipped their invented Jesus story contemporarily and geographically as well, i.e. Semitic, because in this way, they were able to lend their fiction the musty smell of authenticity in a convenient and most effective fashion.

IV. Why the forgers' association had to utilise the tactics of the deliberate contradiction

It means only beginning to penetrate the conceptional scheme of the Jesus narrative: having recognised *that* the tactics of the deliberate contradiction has been consciously and systematically deployed in the gospels. But *why* did the association of the forgers find themselves forced to this peculiar procedure? This is the question with which we have concern ourselves now. There must have been reasons of the utmost importance present, which caused that circle of smart men to so extensively utilise the contradiction tactics. Let it be told a priori already, that *the coercion to contradiction* is most deeply rooted in the christian religion, because it *springs from the dialectic tensions of the christian overall dogma*.

So far, as it were, only external, subordinate contradictions in the gospels have been discussed. More significant, because penetrating the innermost substance of the christian faith, are those deliberate differences which are to be revealed and assessed next.

An educational list of the *main contradictions in the ethical teachings of Jesus*, which *H Windisch* offers in his review of *A Bayet's "Les Morales de L'Evangile"*, may precede: "*He differentiates eight areas in which Jesus is attributed with more or less diametrically opposed teachings*."

1. Moral and rite: *Jesus devalues the old rites (Sabbath, temple cult, washings, fasting) – Jesus makes a stance for their validity, even introduces new rites!* 2. Moral and faith: *Faith in God is sufficient – without faith in Jesus no salvation; the morals, love save us – faith is sufficient, without it no salvation.* 3. Responsibility and freedom: *Jesus expects people to make the decision – predestination and impenitence: the people appear to be unfree.* 4. *The salvation realisation is the reward – the reward is material.* 5. The stance

towards human life: *respect human life, hate your own; Jesus forbids murder, war, death penalty, demands renunciation of all violence, joy over persecutions – people are allowed to kill and love their lives, flee from persecution...* 6. Wealth: *here, communal-ascetic ethics are confronted by conservative economic ethics.* 7. The family: *marriage is a divine institution – celibacy stands higher, one is to leave their wife...; the fertility – the infertility is praised; honour your parents – separate from your parents!* 8. State and church: *submit to the state – the empire is Satan; respect the judges – do not judge; Peter and the apostles are the leaders – nobody shall be first, master, teacher!*"²⁴⁰ [The essence of the Talmud/Judaism...]

It is not required here to examine each of the listed contradictions in depth – this would take up room for an entire book; there are only fundamental observations to be connected to the whole. Once more, let us assume that the gospels are natural script precipitation from primeval Christianity: then how is the existence of such deep-reaching contradictions explained? For centuries, the theologists' acumen has been striving hard for a natural solution to this for the soul and faith of thoughtful Christians embarrassing problem. Now, the "critical" theologian is indeed, as we know, lulling himself into the confidence of having most splendidly clarified the state of affairs with their well-known wildcard solution: the one side (of the contradiction) is "genuine", the other is a legendary newly formation. Unfortunately, this "explanation" stands and falls with the indefensible assumption of the alleged community legend, because after all, all of these contradictions have only been created by the fact that the primeval christian community had, out of a dogmatic-cultish interest, invented Jesus sayings which then collided with the original, real sayings of the master. We know that, and why, the so hotly pursued primevally genuine of Jesus' teachings will never reveal itself to the eyes of the theological researchers: because it evaporates into a phantom as soon as we want to grab it anywhere. The reader may only want to remember the numerous, so miserably failed attempts at separating layers. Should "primevally christian"

men really have been so limited to not realise that they would have to do a wholesale job of tidying up, i.e. that all with the "new" Jesus sayings not conforming "original" sayings would have to be radically re-designed or brushed under the carpet altogether? However, they have quite harmlessly and peacefully placed their invented Jesus words next to the "real" sayings without in the slightest taking any offence with the shrill dissonance of the contradictory contents. Why, it appears as if they had been directly aiming at creating contradictions, because even each individual gospel is crawling with self-contradictions. Only fanatical layer searchers will be able to believe in such naive mental life of "primevally christian" tradition editors (evangelists). The liberal fashion explanation of the above listed contradictions in Jesus teachings: partly original, partly secondary – fails miserably.

Another "natural" explanation of the contradictions' existence is this: on certain things, *Jesus himself* has spoken out *differently*. This "solution" is so absurd however that even a theologian researcher must shake his head and shout: "*One is to simply ask themselves how Jesus must have come across towards his Jewish contemporaries by whom he desired to be understood, if in his preachings, he had somehow meant and really represented all of such wild chaos of contradictions... attributed to him. It is inconceivable.*"²⁴¹ Let another explanation be mentioned here: that privately, Jesus had acted differently to what he had been preaching publically! Hence the contradictions. Now, what about Jesus' "unattained height" of morality, if only in the edifying speech, he presented his ethical principles as absolute, but took them as relative in his own real life? According to the clear reports of the evangelists, theory and practice very badly match in Jesus indeed. He has allegedly "*nowhere to lay his head*" (Matthew 8,20), but finds lodgings and food everywhere, and sends messengers out to prepare for him (Luke 9,52). He "*did not come to be served, but to serve*" (Matthew 20,28), but is accompanied by women and has them serve him (Matthew 27,56; Luke 8,3). Certainly, Jesus once (!) ostentatiously gives a textbook example of serving (when he washed his

disciples' feet), he also heals many sick, but nothing is heard about him perhaps tending to the sick. Healing by miracle surely means a great service to the sick, but to a miracle man, this certainly means no special laborious performance. Desperate attempts have been made "*to understand the two quite opposing sides in Jesus' teachings and behaviour as an inner unity; because after all, that is what they have been within him*", P Feine protests.²⁴² We do away with offering tasters of this researcher's "solutions", we want to merely show how Feine is wrestling and winding, only to contradict himself in the end. Once, it says: "*In the sermon on the mount..., he [Jesus; K.] has sketched up in a clairvoyant form a description of the ideal christian community life. It has been clear to him that such demeanour is not practicable on this sinful Earth.*"²⁴³ Then however, we have to hear to our amazement: "*Jesus has quite certainly posed his demand as such, which can and should be fulfilled.*"²⁴⁴ Thus, Feine offers two "explanations" to choose from.

Time and again anew, it proves impossible to render the new-testamentarian contradictions as being "primevally christian" conceivable, i.e. as naturally formed. These eternal failures no longer amaze us of course, since we know *where* the origin of all these contradictions can be sought and found: in the medieval learned forgers' headquarters. However, what caused these fictionist-philosophers to have even the moral teachings of Jesus not be proclaimed uniquely, but deliberately discrepantly, contradictory in itself? Short and sweet, the reason of the deliberately discrepant moral teachings lies in the fact that the by the medieval christian religion founders created "church" as a "*community of the faithfuls*" was meant to be split *into two classes of Christians*: class of priests and class of laymen – order folk and secular folk – perfect ones and imperfect ones. *Double Christianity: double morality!* In the last chapter, especially this important point will be dealt with in more detail.

Right now, it is our task to list further examples of the deliberate contradiction in the gospels, in order to recognise by them with what thorough contemplation the inner action fabric of the Jesus fiction has been woven.

What do the gospels report on the *baptism*? When on Whitsuntide, Peter held his great advertisement speech, he prompted the audience (Acts 2,28)^{LX} to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. According to this, the cultish practice of the baptism must have been in practice in "primeval Christianity" from day one. We may even conclude from Peter's speech that the baptism in the name of Jesus was meant to be a prerequisite for being admitted into the christian community. We now open up the gospels in order to find out just how Jesus has positioned himself on the baptism question. All four evangelists correspondingly report that the master had himself baptized by the penance preacher (and predecessor) John. So, Jesus placed a great significance on the act of baptizing indeed. *Has Jesus himself then baptized however?* He has naturally performed baptisms himself, the fourth evangelist assures us; but let us now hear how he reports on this. In John 3,22, it says: *Jesus himself baptized*, equally, it is reported and confirmed in John 3,26. In John 4,1, it is mentioned for the third time that the redeemer had baptized, that he had baptized even more often than John (the baptist) but immediately after (namely in John 4,2), the evangelist shyly corrects himself and writes: *"(though Jesus himself did not baptize, but his disciples)"*. Thus, we have here a (deliberate) contradiction in the same sentence, in the same breath! (By the way, such immediate self-contradictions are no rarity with the fourth evangelist: John 4,23: *"But the hour is coming, and now is..."*) Grown curious, we inquire with the other evangelists what they can tell us on this important point. However, they have nothing to tell at all, they all remain completely silent. Especially this silence of the synoptists is of significance however. Surely, this can only be interpreted in a way that Jesus himself has *not* baptized (nor equally his disciples

LX "Acts 2,28" must be a misprint - no talk of baptism there, leastways not in *my* KJ.

during his "lifetime"). Just why else should (in "real" life) the three "first" evangelists – all three! – have suppressed the enormously important fact of baptisms by the master or the disciples, respectively? If the last evangelist nonetheless tells of baptism deeds by Jesus, then it has to be concluded that he (i.e. the community legend) has made this fact up.

However, to the regret of these legend followers, there is all of a sudden a "fact" surfacing, blowing a death knell to their entire legend-thesis. We remember how they [the "researchers"] have been striving to ram it home to us time and again, that already very soon after Jesus' death, the legend had begun being up to its tricks by attributing to, and imputing the resurrected one (following all sorts of suggestions and requests) words and deeds to an enormous extent. If this had "really" been the case, if the community legend had really been so zealously working: then how come that the overtime-working legend had for decades long completely forgotten to also sanction the surely "from the beginning" practised christian baptism, one of the most important cultish deeds in "primeval Christianity", by attributing to Jesus and the disciples (with made-up stories) that they had always performed baptisms? How remarkable: the else allegedly carefreely and wildly fictionalising legend almost forgot for decades long the most necessary, namely to foist the baptizing upon Jesus and the disciples! Only right towards the end, it remembered and manned up at least so far as to have the evangelist John proclaim that Jesus had indeed already baptized as well; but as if a terrible secret had been given away, the confession was instantly taken half back, and corrected: Jesus himself may not have been baptizing, but the disciples were! How silly and shy the legend pretends to be all of a sudden! Whilst all the time, it had it rubbed in its face to also invent stories of the baptizing Jesus; after all, the synoptists report an uttering of the baptist John serving as an inspiration: *there comes one after me, Jesus, ... who will baptize (with... spirit)*. This time however, the legend set at naught even such inspiration and did not dare.

But wait! Right at the end of Matthew's gospel (28,19), there is something of the christian baptism yet. After his resurrection, Jesus commissioned the disciples: "*Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the father and of the son and of the holy spirit.*" An eminently important order; and despite this, Mark (in his "genuine" ending), Luke and even John say *nothing of a baptism order by Jesus*. Well, how peculiar the affair of the baptism in the gospels is perceived and treated. Why the community legend, suddenly turned so shy, despite the strongest efforts, could not be moved to divulge more than just minute, partly coded hints, is a problem which can find no solution in a natural manner. Because if Jesus himself was really baptizing (or if the disciples had done so during his lifetime), then naturally, the synoptists would not have accidentally bypassed, let alone suppressed this fact. If the baptism cult had only been an invention by the primeval community however, then the allegedly else so resolute legend would not have introduced only in the "last" gospel the embarrassed remark that Jesus had been baptizing and yet actually, he had not been baptizing, but only his disciples had carried out baptism deeds. That we are dealing with an artificially generated problem here, hardly requires any further explicit reference. We immediately turn towards the question: *why did the learned forgers proceed so peculiarly in the baptism question?*

Regarding the baptism complex, the late medieval gospel fictionists found themselves facing a difficult situation. An embarrassing dilemma did not allow for uniqueness and clarity in the details concerning the baptism. On the one hand, it went without saying for the forgers to trace the (by them into the new philosophy religion of Christianity introduced) baptism rite (as well as the Lord's supper cult) back to Jesus' very own initiative. After all, the necessity of the christian baptism was only then justified, and without any doubt justified, if it were reported that Jesus himself had given the order as well as an example of the baptism. It was altogether unavoidable to report at least in one place of the gospels, how the master had

indeed ordered the disciples to baptize all the nations. (In this, it is by no means a coincidence that such order was given by the resurrected one in the last minute, before his going home to the father). Primarily however, the importance and necessity of the baptism could be highlighted and illustrated by showing via a tale how the master did not perhaps baptize himself, but *he himself had baptized*. "*... for thus it is fitting...*" (Matthew 3,15) They [the forgers] would with pleasure have further reported that Jesus and the disciples themselves had baptized all sorts of those who had turned faithful – but this was not on, because an insurmountable dogmatic difficulty was presenting an obstacle. When they therefore yet divulged the laconic message by the evangelist John that Jesus himself had baptized, they immediately took back this dangerous confession and corrected: not the master himself, but the disciples baptized! But even with this, they had reluctantly made more concessions than they could dogmatically allow for. It becomes momentarily clear where the actual difficulty lies, when we observe of what the nature of the baptism deed of the penance preacher and predecessor John consists. The predecessor himself speaks it out: my baptism is only a water baptism. And as opposed to such John baptism, by what does the nature of the *christian* baptism make itself known? On this, too, the predecessor can educate us by saying: I baptize with water, but Jesus will baptize with the holy spirit. Thus, the special element of the christian baptism is to be recognised in the fact that externally (like the John baptism), it may be a water baptism, but internally, it is a spirit baptism. Now, why should the nature of this spirit baptism be a dogmatic impossibility for having Jesus and the disciples (during his Earthly existence) themselves baptize?

They [the forgers] have the baptism, which is a sacrament like the Lord's supper, i.e. a priestly deed necessary for redemption, "instituted"-ordered by the Lord himself. However, the "institution" is not at all the essential thing in the creation of such sacrament. The sacraments are by no means substantially realised by institution yet; why, an explicit

institution (order) is basically irrelevant and superfluous for the nature of the sacraments, because those are "*created*" *by a* (different, special) *deed*. (This is why in the fourth gospel, the irrelevant institution of the Lord's supper has been completely bypassed, in order to highlight the subordinate character of the institution.) By the evangelist John, it is now directly spoken out, *which deed had substantially created the sacraments: Jesus' redemption death!* Thus, we finally get to the answer to our problem, why Jesus himself was not permitted to baptize, and why the disciples as well, as long as the master was "alive", could "substantially" not baptize, and were not permitted to, either. "*Sacramental elements* [baptising water and eucharistic food; K.], *which mediate to the faithful the logos spirit* [holy spirit; K.] *cannot exist, according to John's gospel, for as long as this spirit is incarnated in the Earthly Christ himself, i.e. they are possible only after his death... In truth, the sacraments... become possible just by Jesus' death, as long as via his death, the in him incarnated logos spirit becomes free... [and; K.] ...becomes transferable onto the faithful.*"²⁴⁵

So, because there can be a christian spirit baptism only on the basis of Jesus' death, this is why Jesus himself could not, and was not permitted to baptize, and this is why they [the forgers] could "actually" not yet have the disciples "lawfully" baptize during his life time, either.

Our observation of the baptism affair in the gospels has not yet found its conclusion, we have to once again return to the starting point. We set out to show by the problem complex of the baptism, with what thorough contemplation the tactics of the deliberate contradiction has been handled on this occasion as well, and with what acumen the uniform construction of ideas of the overall mass of the gospels has been timbered. It is not enough to establish together with the theologians, that the thought of a realistic creation of the sacraments by Jesus' death causing the spirit's liberation is a late speculation by John, and that therefore, the fourth evangelist had to immediately take back his careless statement that Jesus

himself was baptizing as incompatible with his theory. We are primarily interested in the already highlighted remarkable stance of the "first" three evangelists on the baptism question, or, in other words, we are still puzzled over the peculiar shyness of the "community legend" on this important cult subject. And now, the solution to the mystery is quite easily becoming clear to us, and we are taking a look into the innermost grid of the context of ideas between all four gospels. The consortium of the gospel inventors has been in agreement that the nature of the (by the philosophers among them thought up) christian spirit baptism would make it impossible to have Jesus himself baptize in a "christian" fashion. So, there was nothing left but to have the first three evangelists remain silent on baptism deeds by Jesus and the disciples in the first place – the legend was not permitted to be active here! – and to also immediately take back the small concession in the John gospel. Since the disciples as well were permitted to begin with the christian baptism actually only after Jesus' death, they [the forgers] had Jesus give this order to the disciples only when after the resurrection, he left Earth for good, in order to send the "spirit" instead of him.

The time and again surfacing deliberate contradictions in the realm of the gospels (and the NT per se) must not, as the skilful and carefully contemplated treatment of the baptism problem has testified to just then, be judged as the result of playfulness and fancy on the side of the learned authors; it [the deliberate contradiction] is not at all a voluntary affair, but a most involuntary one.^{LXI} *The origin of the deliberate contradiction lies in the nature of the christian religion itself. Christianity is a contradiction religion through and through.* What we have anticipated as a result at the beginning of this chapter: that the unavoidable *coercion to contradict stems from the dialectic tensions of the christian dogmas*, we see confirmed now.

LXI I do think that Kammeier has it backwards here, he even explains it in the next two sentences exactly how he's got it backwards; see also the "After thoughts" at the end.

Already during the formulation of the first principle of the christian philosophy, the thinkers found themselves entangled in a contradiction. This principle, as is well-known, determines *the nature of the christian God (Godfather)* to the effect that God is *love*. (*Thus, God has loved the world, so that he gave his son, so that all who believed in him will once have eternal life!*) In principle, God's love may be addressing all people; but in practice, it by no means addresses *unconditionally* every single person, i.e. it takes actual effect only towards *those* people who believe in the son. He who does not believe will be damned. In the christian philosophy, the loving God is necessarily revealed to also be the opposite and contradiction of love, namely a merciless *judge*. This contradiction in the nature of the Christians' God cannot be eliminated at all, and it is (in the christian religion) not meant to be eliminated, either: after all, the entire christian-philosophical system is built upon this contradiction with conscious intent. In the ban of this system, only he *shall* qualify to be declared blessed who believes in the divine son and especially in his salvation death: thus demands the purpose of this philosophy. And this religion *must* decree so, because its practical use – formation of a union of Christ believers – simply demands "faithfuls" as supporters of the system. By uttering the word faith (faithfuls) however, we unwittingly end up in a contradiction again.

This time, it is about the *contradiction* in the justification doctrine. "*Either, attributing Christ's justice (towards the faithfuls) is perceived as a process unfolding independently of the behaviour of a person; then the result here was... a self-deception of God, a justice of God that was none: God hid from himself the true state of affairs by purely arbitrarily hanging Christ's justice on a person like a coat. Or, if this was to be avoided, and it was to be highlighted that Christ's justice was simply to be attributed only to the faithful, then the damage would potentially grow worse; because now, the faith appeared to be the condition under which God would reward; it [the faith] would indeed get the meaning of a*

merit which God rewarded."²⁴⁶ We have quoted here *K Holl's* description of *Luther's* justification doctrine (in the form of its modification by *Melanchton*). However, it was not only *Luther* who had discovered the contradiction pointed out here, or even created it in the first place. The "old" church fathers have not created it, either. (That these church fathers are invented characters as well, follows from the temporal placement of the medieval falsification enterprise.) Much rather, this justification contradiction essentially permeates the entire fourfold gospel, i.e. the contrast has been deliberately carried into the overall gospels.

The theological researchers could of course never have suspected that such *contradictions have been deliberately and a priori* planted, much less can they admit to this, because according to their inherited conviction, the gospels are naturally formed precipitation of the tradition from primevally christian times. Orthodox theologists furthermore possess the gift of not even perceiving contradictions in the gospels: to them, everything is adding up to the most beautiful harmony, equally so in the case of the determination of the Christians' Godfather's nature as well. Modern liberal theologists may not deny the existence of the contradictions, but they know what they owe to the religious situation of the times (the way they perceive it). Therefore, they rid the evangelistic world of the contradiction in the nature of God by throwing the *one* side of the contradiction – the Jewish rewarding judge-God – on the big garbage heap of the "legend" as *secondary* community dogmatics. (This arbitrariness procedure of layer separation no longer deserves being refuted. [Thank you.]) The so-called "dialecticians" amongst the theologists are more courageous here. After the example of *K Barth*, they acknowledge two opposing character traits in God, and they are even striving to emphasise this discrepancy more than before. We cannot concern ourselves with these dialecticians in great detail here, but we want to reference some characteristic statements of the dialectic theology, in which the two-pole system of the christian philosophy is nicely coming to light. "*The human being is only ever acquitted as condemned by God.*" "*This*

judgement is mercy. This condemnation is forgiveness. This terrible God is the loving father."

As we can see, in religion, the dialecticians have a perception which is, in a manner of speaking, rough, but hearty. For this theology, the christian-religious truth, according to a very pensive phraseology, lies "*in each case in the middle between yes and no.*" ²⁴⁷

It has become clear to the reader where the real origin of the striking contradictions in the gospels is to be found: in the learned workshop of the medieval gospel fictionists. From the very beginning, the contradictions as such were consciously woven into the literary fabric of ideas of the gospel essence. Thus, in reverse, these carefully weighed contradictions testify with a loud voice to the *uniform origin of all gospels*. We perceive a *uniform will* watching over everything.

V. The mystery of the gospels as a literary form

For our overall line of evidence: that all four gospels owe their shared origin to the systematic action of a medieval association of learned men – not only the contents of these scripts, but also their *literary form* are of significance. We therefore place the problem of the form at the centre of this chapter.

In order to answer a question which has caused much headache to the theological defenders as well as all to previous deniers of Jesus' historicity, we once again approach the gospels from the "outside". The sub-question shows aspects in terms of both form and content. Regarding the form, the new problem is this: *how is the peculiar literary form* of the "primevally christian" script output going by the name of 'gospels' *explained*? After all, these writings completely bust the framework of the remaining stock of "primevally christian"

literature: alien and lonesome, they lie like erratic blocks in the realm of their alleged contemporaries. In the following, we want to pursue this question, and first take note of what the defenders of the historical Jesus have established on the peculiar standing, which the gospels as a literary genre hold in the general literature history of their alleged time of creation. So, for the time being and against better knowledge, we accept the inherited presumption of the supporters of Jesus' historicity that the gospels are scripts from "primeval Christianity". Now, to which literary genre are the gospels as a formal entity to be counted? A first clue is offered by the sub-question: *to what end have the evangelists written those books of the NT* which have been given the special name 'gospels'?

At least *one* "primevally christian" evangelist is kind enough to explicitly name the purpose that he was pursuing with his script. In his prologue of his gospel, *Luke* speaks out towards his sponsor Theophilus as follows: "*...it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write to you an orderly account, most excellent Theophilus...*" So, Luke wants to record a true story of the life of Jesus – his words must be understood so. He wants to occupy himself, his message to Theophilus is testifying to this clearly enough, *as a biographer*. To pass on truthful memories of Jesus' life and work is his literary objective. That his memories are meant to serve edifying purposes, or the requirements of catechism, mission and apologetics, respectively, merely complicates this objective, but by no means cancels it. Also, that his biography is most fragmentary and has come out badly anyhow, does not change a thing. And the other evangelists also want to serve the same purpose with their scripts as Luke, albeit they do not particularly emphasize this: to give to the co-world and posterity news of Jesus, of his deeds and teachings; naturally, equally with the practical final objective of patronising and edifying the community. With this, as a characteristic moment of the "primevally christian" authors' peculiarity, the ultimate objective is shining through: *to edify and advertise through "history"*.

Thus, regarding their form-related literary genre, the gospels were to be addressed as historical memories (memoirs), and could perhaps be compared to the simultaneous biography literature of the folkish kind, the way it is for example presented in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* or in the work of Philostrates, Appolonius of Tana. And indeed of course, the "early christian" apologist Justin already called the gospels "memories". Most recently, especially the form historians are raising objections against such classification, and rightfully so, albeit their basic thesis of the "pre-formed" oral gospel is indefensible, as we know. Their claim that the evangelists had busied themselves merely as naive collectors and compilers of an already orally pre-formed Jesus tradition, i.e. that they had literarily behaved *more passively than actively*, already falls apart by the fact that each literature-critical examination – just think of the carefully planted contradictions – shows an extraordinary *activity* of the individual evangelists. However, the form historians are in the right, inasmuch as they refuse to accept the gospel writers as real biographers who would have made it their job to create a written record of a truthful tradition. Namely regarding their "historical" purpose, their works are giving the evangelists the lie. That even the evangelical "historian" par excellence, the good Luke, has well overreached himself when he solemnly announced wanting to work as an independently researching biographer, is a realisation long gained by the form historians. He may have proven to be a very skilled and most active narrator and designer in a purely formal regard – *"Everywhere, we see a conscious action, a careful contemplation down to the details."*²⁴⁸ – but on the basis of his thorough investigation of the chronological framework, *K L Schmidt*, even about the zealous Luke, arrives at the devastating result : *"The prologue pretends as if the author were offering something special just by the accuracy and the order of events. But every step of the way, we have been able to keep tabs on him, how he, on the basis of a special tradition, does not perhaps introduce new chronological and topographical elements to Jesus' history beyond Mark, but how in his struggle to create a better context,*

changes the Mark sketch on the basis of psychology and logic."²⁴⁹ For Luke as a biographer and historian, who he wants to be after all, this truly is no praise, because he had of course thought up a better order of events. With this truth researcher, we find no trace of the alleged research regarding the "real" unfolding of Jesus "history". His work reveals itself to be a mere desk affair, and it consists of smashing Mark's chronology, in order to newly re-construct - i.e. utterly arbitrarily – the smithereens on the basis of psychology and logic.

Mark and Matthew also prove to be failures as historical research characters, just like Luke, they reveal themselves as arbitrarily proceeding fictionists of chronological context. For this, we can once more reference the critical investigations of the above mentioned *K L Schmidt*. Another researcher, *E Fascher*, is drawing the following conclusion regarding the evangelical chronology: "*We have nowadays realised that the synoptical evangelists... do not even want to give a historical report, but put snapshots of Jesus' life in a naively constructed framework, which is partly a pure product of embarrassment, and may be partly referred to as authentic in individual fragments.*"²⁵⁰ Fragments *may perhaps* be "authentic"! *Fascher* reckons that the "primevally christian" authors had not even *wanted* to give a historical report; which in no case holds true for Luke, because he explicitly emphasises that he wanted to narrate chronologically accurately.

In truth, things are now standing so: in pursuing their tactics of the deliberate contradiction, the medieval forgers' association had soon realised how advantageous it was to have the fictionalised Jesus drama unfold in a topographic-chronologically *elastic* framework. Naturally, in this Jesus fiction, as prose, in detail and on the whole, *different chronological arrangements* were a priori possible, and the forgers' consortium could have decided on a fixed frame, had this been practical. However, considerations of a psychological, logical and primarily dogmatic nature have eventually settled it: to have each of the four gospels incorporated into a different, more or less altered framework regarding the

temporal and geographical framework. The earlier discussed location shift just shows how planfully the variation was handled in a topographical regard as well; even more clearly does the enormous elasticity of the *chronological* framework stand out in a comparison of the gospels. For often discussed reasons, "primevally christian" authors would have naturally never dared so flippantly, recklessly and arbitrarily treat the most important, all-known chronological-topographical facts of Jesus' life. The learned forgers of the Middle Ages on the other hand, were able to apply, without being unmasked by "primevally christian" contemporaries, the tactics of the elastic framework with a clear conscience, since after all, their literary fabrications were fiction arbitrarily backdated by more than a thousand years.

Thus, the form historians are correct with their claim that the gospels should not be permitted to be viewed as actual biographies (memoirs). Now, if not with memoirs, with what else could the gospels most appropriately be compared? The answer given by *K L Schmidt* in a different examination does not sound alienating and surprising to us at all anymore.

According to this, from a literary viewpoint, the gospels are to be placed in a row with the *medieval (!) legend and folkish books*! Legend books – this is what the gospels are! As parallels, *Schmidt* references the German folkish books about Till Eulenspiegel and Doctor Faust.²⁵¹ In the nature of the literary design process, the gospels are supposedly also closely related to the *legends of the saints*. "*Here as much as there, we observe the people [orig.: Volk], once as the creator and carrier of the tradition, and then the ... legend writer who begins his work only later (the collecting of the individual legend fragments to a whole). The people as the unnamed creator is a mysterious agent, which forms much, re-forms much, develops much....A kind of presentation is crystallising out, which is neither fully corresponding with reality, nor is it false throughout... What has been said applies to the gospels to a significant extent.*"²⁵² As has been noted, *Schmidt* still views the gospels as "primevally christian" products; but the reader knows better what to make of this "primevally

christian" anonymous agent that invents and forms. What remains interesting at least is the established baffling correspondence of the gospels with distinct folkish and legend books, in a form-literary regard as well.

The mystery of the gospels as a literary form also shows, as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, an aspect *of content*, and this is of particular importance. The question now is this: which aspects have been guiding the creation of the gospel scripts? What has caused the evangelists to so peculiarly and mysteriously design their alleged biographies of Jesus? Whence did they take the motifs and templates for their literary design? The form historians, caught in the idea that the gospels be the beyond any measure legendised cult writings from "primeval Christianity", have been unable to unravel the mystery of the existence of the gospels in a natural fashion. So, let us inquire with the previous *deniers of Jesus' historicity*. After all, from *Bruno Bauer* to *Arthur Drews*, these sceptics have been wrestling just as zealously with the problem: *after what recipe have the gospels been fictionalised and formed?* If in the following, we briefly discuss the views of some of these researchers, then in doing so, we must always keep in mind that all previous critical sceptics as well – as already emphasised in Book 1 of this work – are in error over the *point in time*, and thus over the true root cause of the invention of the Jesus novel. For the gospels have by no means been invented in the 2nd century, but have been created only around a thousand years later.

Arthur Drews has stubbornly steered the attention of the researchers towards the *central way of viewing*, as the basis of the entire christian (new-testamentarian) literature, in particular the gospels. Especially with the Mark gospel, he believes having proven that the star-studded skies have supposedly rendered an excellent service to the author of this gospel as "*framework and the uniting and determining band*". What is meant by this? Drews has discovered that there exists an "*obvious conformity between the course of the evangelical*

*narrative and the course of the sun through the zodiac".*²⁵³ The procedure of this Mark-fictionist, allegedly from the 2nd century, is meant to be imagined in a way, that he viewed the individual images (stations) of the antique zodiac in the sky as a welcome inspiration, in order to conceive and arrange from them the individual stories of the Mark gospel. According to *Drews'* hypothesis, "the author" has gotten the idea to invent a tale of the healing of Peter's mother-in-law thus: Jesus' first appearance to Capernaum is allegedly referring to the heavenly sign of Aries. (This is a purely arbitrary assumption!) In the zodiac, we now see *"simultaneously with Aries, the heliacally rising image of Andromeda, i.e. surfacing from the dawn. On the old (sky) globes, Andromeda used to be depicted as a tied up woman between two rocks, in whose place also two pieces of wood may well have been drawn, which could be viewed as a kind of resting place or bed. So far, the figure lay stretched out on the horizon. Now, with the entrance of the sun into Aries, it rises up on the side of the Northern [Zodiac] Pisces, to which it thus seems to be in a close relationship, and in which we have to view the astral representative of the first disciple (Peter), and which could in this way easily have given the evangelists the idea of the erection (healing) of Peter's mother-in-law during his stay in Capernaum."*²⁵⁴

Anybody can sense how affected and violently dragged by its hair this astral "explanation" of a biblical apparition is coming across. And now, the hypothesis does not only demand that the Mark evangelist would have had to oracle out the entire mass of the Jesus tales from out of the images of the zodiac in the sketched light-hearted manner, but in order to be able to trace back the overall fabric of the Mark gospel to the alleged astral origin at all, our researcher finds himself forced to have three rounds through the zodiac progress, i.e. to have the tortured author magic up *three different stories from the same celestial image* [template]. Under so much artificiality, the astral hypothesis completely collapses; a correct thought has been run into the ground. *Drews* himself has probably realised this, too, because

regarding for example the origin of the story of Peter's mother-in-law, he reckons: he, to whom his astral tracing may not appear convincing, would still have the path open of assuming any old old-testamentarian parallel as the author's potential template. And in a different place, it even says quite generically: *"Besides this, the proof of Jesus' non-historicity is quite independent of how we position ourselves to the astral descriptions. Their influence on the evangelical description has essentially been of a formal nature."*²⁵⁵

Regarding the robustness of the hypothesis, this sounds quite pitiable.

Drews now, as a further inspiration substitute for "the" Mark-author, has the Old Testament at the ready, just in case. *"The history of Jesus has in conscious deliberation been inferred from the AT."* Here as well, a correct basic thought has once more been strongly overstretched. *Drews* prevails only with massive limitations. The forgers of the Middle Ages (*not perhaps individual authors* in the 2nd century!), in the design and arrangement of the Jesus stories, have indeed also occasionally used the AT as well as the zodiac image series as an inspiration; but such inspiration, seen on the whole, plays quite a minimal part. As we will make clear in the final chapters, the real and principal inspiration hit the forgers' association from an entirely different angle.

This has also to be said towards *H Raschke*, who has pointed out that in the Jesus novel, wordplay has often been effective in a concealed manner – that is, in allusions to town and landscape names. This has supposedly happened in a fashion that from certain Aramaic place names, via wordplay, certain stories of Jesus have been invented. An example: according to Luke 9,12, the wonderful feeding takes place at Bethsaida; and Bethsaida literally translates roughly to "eating house". With this perception, *Raschke* is partially right, but it is a good thing that he is restricting himself, and explains: *"At any rate, we are [standing] immediately before the realisation... that even in the gospels as well, in individual stories, the conscious interpretation of place and landscape names is involved in the*

construction of the gospels."²⁵⁶ L Feiler wants to trace the formation of Christianity back to the spirit of magical thinking, and thus, wants to make the mysterious design of the gospels understandable; in this, he refers mainly to the *Secret meaning hypothesis* by W B Smith. According to this, "*the deeds and events of Jesus are historicised parables*".²⁵⁷ The "primeval Christians", or so Feiler patronises us (and perceives by this the gospel authors of the 2nd century), as mystics (like the Essenes), loved to write down their views on the Empire of God in a secret metaphorical language (parable language) only understood by them. Such propensity for metaphorical language is, according to Feiler, to be addressed as the form of expression of the magical spirit. Besides this however, a more practical cause was supposedly responsible for this secrecy, namely the command to camouflage and self-protection of the relevant "primevally christian myths". "*The new doctrine... must disguise [towards the supporters of the Pagans' Gods; K.], it enjoys doing it, too, in order to keep a mysterious character in its truths. Only he shall hear »who has ears to hear«, the initiate.*"^{258,LXII} All evangelical stories have a meaning, they are never to be taken literally. According to Smith and Feiler, what does for example the miracle event "mean", viewed quite generally for the time being? "*What does it mean that Jesus ongoingly performs miracles despite the explanation: »this is a wicked generation. It desires a sign (miracle) and yet, it is not given a sign except the sign of the prophet Jonas.« Surely only that all miracles together are no different to that of Jonas: the conversion of humanity. The blind and deaf are those who do not recognise the doctrine, the lame who do not follow it, the leprous and obsessed who serve multiple Gods, the poor and equally the dogs are the Pagans who do not have the true doctrine...*"²⁵⁹ This calls for head-shaking all-round! What wondrous wonder explanation! Once again, an occasionally correct explanation is boundlessly generalised. Whilst the alleged "secret" of Jesus' wonder deeds is hidden in plain sight, and is announced even in the

LXII Always interesting to see how the terminology in 'clerical' literature coincides with that in freemasonry: here, it's initiates, earlier, we've had perfect ones and profanes etc.

gospels themselves: Jesus performed miracles (especially miracle healings), for one, because such power deeds had been foretold him, as the messiah, by the prophets, and for another, he performed the miracles as proof of his divine mission and provenance, in order for the disciples and all the people "to believe in him".

As opposed to *Feiler*, *Smith*, *Drews* etc., we emphasize that even the *miracle stories* are not perhaps to be taken as "historical facts", but in the sense of the authors, i.e. the medieval fictionist-philosophers, *ideally literally* as Jesus' power deeds, in order to justify their significance. The vast majority of the Jesus novel's individual reports serves, we will still see it, the most *practical* purposes of the most manifold kind, albeit it shall of course not be denied that occasionally, in addition, a deeper meaning is inherent in a tale (especially with the evangelist John). By no means however, is the "meaning" then so simple and uniform as *Feiler* suspects, and we are to avoid treating all miracle tales alike because of some background secret – opposition between old and new doctrine. Some *Feilerian* examples may serve as a warning sign.

According to *Feiler's* view, the fact that the wedding to Kana is placed at the start of Jesus' miracle doings is significant. Now, according to our critic, in what does the deeper meaning of this historicised "parable" lie? "*Pagan and Jewish humanity wed each other, in order to become one in the new doctrine. But they have nothing but water, the symbol of the Jewish law of cleansing. Jesus transforms it into the wine of the new doctrine, wine the way the guests have never drunk it before... Momentarily, the external mother of the new doctrine is standing there: Judaism; the latter however, immediately executes the separation: wife, what have I to do with you?*"²⁶⁰ If *Feiler* now asks: "*Out of this alleged history, does not the old unhistorical parable [of the old and the new doctrine; K.] peek out?* – then we can only reply to him: if we violently and arbitrarily force the parable into [something], it will peek out again indeed. – Another example, the tale of Mary and Martha. "*In Beth-Ania, i.e. according*

*to Smith in »the house of she, who is troubled much«, and that is probably Palestine, where mankind is much troubled with the law, lives Martha, the lady, i.e. the strict Jewry, with Mary, the half-Pagan humanity. Mary is listening to the joyous message, but Martha is troubled much – add »with observing the law« – and demands the same of Mary. However, the new doctrine (Jesus) praises the actions of Mary, and rejects those of Martha."*²⁶¹ *"Is this history then?"*, Feiler asks, and we retort: certainly not, because the gospels are fiction throughout; but we will soon show that the fiction of Mary and Martha has quite a simple, most practical and "literal" meaning.

According to Feiler, in the tale of the rich young man, this rich one of course, again "means" Jewry or the old doctrine, respectively. Of his treasure, he can give nothing to the poor, i.e. the Pagans, he is therefore locked out of the Empire of heaven. In reality however, in the sense of the gospel fictionists, the meaning of even this negative example tale lies on the practical level, and is to be taken very much literally; this report has nothing to do with some parable secret of deeper meaning. Even assuming however, that the alleged mystics of the 2nd century had been driven by a magical desire of the soul to create the individual pieces of their Jesus fiction in metaphorical parable language, it would nonetheless remain unintelligible why they made such an anxiously kept secret out of this cordially ordinary, why, this nullity of "deeper meaning". After all, this alleged basic meaning (the opposition between the old and the new doctrine) really was an equally ordinary and insipid as well as a primarily open secret, since such opposition was a priori well-known by followers as well as opponents; each new doctrine is of course positioned towards the old doctrine in a relationship of tension. There was absolutely no point in making a secret out of this. – As a result of this chapters' discussions, we can book the realisation that neither the defenders, nor the deniers of Jesus' historicity have been able to tackle the problem of the gospels as a literary genre in the right spot, and bring it to a solution.

VI. Blueprint and action mechanism of the dramatic Jesus narrative

Getting to the bottom of the secret of the gospels as a literary genre means learning to understand the blueprint after which the fourfold overall gospel has been erected equally as a four-nave basilica. He who has not acquired the necessary critical specialist knowledge will not be able to see through the strange chaos of lines of the evangelical drawing of the plan; we have found this confirmed by the fruitless efforts that have been undertaken in this regard. Only the discovery of the secret blueprint can unlock the understanding of the gospel temple's design; and now, by our investigation, we are in the fortunate position of having come into possession of this code-key.

The overall result of our previous critical assessment of the gospel substance can be summarised in two brief statements. Firstly: the gospels are not to be addressed as naturally created precipitation of the tradition of real ("primevally christian") history, they much rather offer purpose fiction through and through, which has been disguised as a historical biography for its practical purposes however. Secondly: the gospels have not been successively fictionalised in the 2nd century by different authors – as erroneously assumed by all previous deniers of Jesus' historicity – but they represent the uniform community product of a literary action of the late Middle Ages. With this realisation, we already hold the key to the manufacturing secret of the overall gospels in our hand. *We must not focus our attention on an individual gospel, but view all four gospels combined as a literary uniform body.* So, we are dealing with the community blueprint upon which all gospels as a literary unit are founded. With this, a critical *formal principle* has been established, as it were, by which we can let ourselves guide.

Still missing is a *material principle* as a forward driving factor of the investigation process. We find it in the overall gospels themselves, where it is clearly and explicitly

outlined. The material principle lies incorporated within the basic idea of the Jesus drama and is this: God the father has given up his son, so that in the figure of a "real" human being and by his voluntary death of atonement, he could redeem sinful humankind, and again reconcile and unify them with God.

1. The mechanism of the plot

In order to get to the bottom of the design secret of the overall gospels, we want to put ourselves in the shoes, i.e. the role and situation, of the late medieval fictionist-philosophers who saw before themselves the literary task to design and scenically construct the Jesus drama *in line with the by them fixed basic idea (reconciliation of sinful humanity by the death of atonement of God's son Jesus)*. Guided by this given idea, we want to attempt *to achieve a Jesus fiction by our own contemplation*.

At first, it is about constructing the plot in a coarse outline. In doing so, we must remember that we are not to invent the personal record of an ordinary human being, but that we have to fictionalise the fate of an Earthly human being who may be "real", but who at the same time (according to the basic idea) has to be a divine being. That is, the workings of this twofold designed personality are meant to have taken place, according to the well contemplated plan of the fictionists' association, during the times of the Roman Emperor Augustus amongst the Jews. (The medieval forgers were insightful and careful enough to backdate the "history" of Jesus by over a thousand years.) Since the hero of our fiction is meant to be a human being and a true God (God's son) at the same time, we must not neglect to duly feature *both* sides in the overall gospel that was to be designed. After some contemplation already, we will find it useful to *split the overall gospel into two sub-sections for the time being*, in order to emphasise in the first version (the synoptical gospel!) mainly

the *human-Earthly* side of Jesus, and in the second version (the John gospel) the *divine-heavenly* side of this person. (It goes without saying, that in the first version, we must not entirely neglect the divine nature, in the second, we must not entirely neglect the purely Earthly nature.) Forced on the one hand by the with the basic idea necessarily given discrepant nature or ambiguity, respectively, furthermore caused by the factual impossibility to rigidly and uniquely fix the individual invented details, we find ourselves forced to *once again divide the synoptical gospel*. In order to enable us to incorporate the by all means necessary contradictions [!], it turns out that three versions are useful according to the contradiction scheme $a - b - ab$: so, we determine *three* gospels as human-Earthly oriented "biographies of our hero. In this way, the construction plan of the Jesus fiction is sketched in its rough outline.

It does not cause us any particular effort now, to think up how the life and workings of this divine human being in the framework of the overall plan, for the time being, is to be designed in general situations, because his *workings* are of course necessarily prescribed and pre-designed for this Jesus by his *life's mission* (basic idea: redemption of sinful humanity!). It is easy to see that Jesus, the human being, must behave as God's deputy, as his prophet, his mouthpiece, that he has to give enlightenment to his contemporaries on God's "true" will (on the new christian doctrine to be propagated by the association!). So, we make scenes up showing this Jewish prophet, how he travels the land as a rabbi proclaiming the new "right" morality. We have to of course have him proclaim a "new" *morality*. If we wanted him to merely again warm up old morality points, then we would simply not require and be able to describe him as the prophet, whom we (i.e. the medieval forgers!) are in need of for the *pursued practical purpose* after all. (On this practical purpose of the falsification enterprise, we will find out in more detail in the next chapter.) Since this by God chosen one is at the same time meant to be of divine origin, he is of course indeed capable as well, better than all

the earlier prophets (who were mere human beings), to reveal his heavenly father's true will. In this way, the new (christian) doctrine (morality) is becoming the only true, the "truly" divine, the unconditionally binding revelation of God's will, leaving behind all other earlier (and later!) moral commands as obsolete. That our hero has to thus stand up and rail *against the "old"* morality goes without saying, and we have to design our scenes accordingly. At this point now, temporarily, we want to briefly interrupt our role as inventors of the Jesus fiction, in order to insert some necessary and essential comments on

2. The nature of christian morality

Regardless of who is talking about christian morality, they are primarily referring to the "*sermon on the mount*" with its new commands – but *in what way are they referring to them* [the commands]? *Are they referring to, and do they understand the commands of the sermon on the mount literally, semi-literally, metaphorically, idealistically?* Do they believe having to follow them comprehensively, unconditionally and literally, or do they take the liberty to self-righteously modify for themselves the "divine" demands addressed to their insight, their taste, their ability and their personal situation and fancy, i.e. to discount, i.e. to avoid them? Namely, for each in the "world" living Christian, the by God's son proclaimed commands are not only difficult and very difficult, but much rather, *for worldly bound Christians, they can partially not be followed and fulfilled at all!* The christian morality is a superhuman morality, a supermorality. However, the sermon on the mount pretends to be divine will of opinion addressing *every* human being who should therefore be striving to obey the divine commands unconditionally and literally. Regarding the question of the true origin and the nature of this morality however, from the standpoint of our findings, the conclusion becomes unavoidable: since Jesus is an invented person, the christian morality cannot stem from him; the morality of the gospel, especially the sermon on the mount, much rather originates with the philosophical world of ideas of the late medieval association of the gospel

authors. Those learneds, philosophers and moralists of the Middle Ages have contemplated and decreed in many joint consultations what should be rated morally valuable for the christian church to be implemented, and what should therefore be taught in the gospel fiction through Jesus' mouth as wanted by God.

The christian morality, the way it has been expressed most purely in the sermon on the mount, is an artificial product of morality, is the result of long contemplation. *Heroism*, the divine highness and the strictness of these ethics are much praised. How did this heroism come about however? And why do these demands sound so heroic? *Because the so far valid ethical laws have consciously been overreached*. After all, the rules of morality of all peoples and times were known to the authors, as philosophers and moralists, and they have used what could be used for the purpose. The element of heroism in Christianity stems from the fact that the new morality has been *deliberately* raised to be superhuman (supernatural, counter-natural, respectively). ("...I tell you not to resist an evil person." "...whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also." "...bless those who curse you..." "... he who does not hate father and mother..." etc. The heroism has been achieved by the tactics of offhand suspending some commands of natural morality, or turning them upside down, respectively, by for example having counter-natural commands be praised as the highest virtues (absolute chastity, marriage-lessness). Sharp acumen has worked its part in this: *namely*, the Christ-believing pious person *is not meant to be capable of fulfilling such demands by their own strength!* And they *had to* pose such *unfulfillable* demands, *because the postulated basic idea demanded it*. This is easy to understand: assuming that the pious person were capable of indeed fully complying with the ethical demands, then they could of course justify themselves before God by their own strength and effort, i.e. by their own merit. And this would mean: Jesus' sacrificial death is fully unnecessary in this case, as irrelevant for the person's justification! However, the basic idea of the Jesus drama manifests and

demands especially the absolute *salvation necessity of Christ's death of atonement*. After all, only therefore *must* Jesus sacrifice his life, *because* the sinful human being (according to the new doctrine) can never justify themselves before God by their own merit. That they perhaps perform once this or that heroic deed is not relevant in this; the real Christian would of course have to obey every time, and they would have to obey all these demands literally, if they were to be blessed by their own actions.

Have then the learned morality inventors not considered that with the heroism of the ethical demands, they would probably more deter than they would attract the faithful [meant] to be recruited? Naturally, they have considered this point as well. They have been clear about it a priori, that they could have the new morality be preached *not only* in a superhuman form. It was not permitted to pose only ever heroic demands. In real life, they would of course have to account for human nature and its physical limitations as well as the social circumstances of the faithful. In other places of their fiction, the authors were therefore quite happy *to have Jesus talk differently* of the new morality. In these places, the heroism was considerably cut down and softened. This time, they primarily approached the natural relationships of human beings (family, marriage, state) generously, and had them explicitly acknowledged and sanctioned by Jesus! This is where the forgers found a *good field of application for the deliberate contradiction*. What in this place was demanded mercilessly, was in another place taken back coded in gentle words or directly outright. Thus, they created for every christian heart in each situation and mood the relevant suitable and desired morality. Depending on the state of affairs, the priests could place upon the individual faithful either the heavy, the heaviest, or the gentle yoke.

We now return to lighting up the overall gospels' blueprint.

3. *The impenitence of the Jewish people as the artificial driving force of the plot*

Out of the gospel inventors' well-contemplated decision having the to be invented christian philosophy religion appear as a further development of the monotheistic Jewish religion, and having Jesus accordingly *appear as a Jew rabbi*, the following considerations arise for us in the role of plagiarising authors regarding the literary course of the plot. Jesus, the hero of our drama, is chosen to proclaim the "new" morality, commissioned by God. For us as plagiarists, there is a difficulty arising here. Has not the same God (Jahve), ages ago, related his will to his chosen people by Moses (and the old prophets)? Yet seriously, God can now *not* suddenly reveal through Jesus a *completely different* will of opinion than previously through Moses, because after all, Jahve is not a fickle character. To us, what is the conclusion from this? We plagiarists have no choice left at all but to have Jesus *also in principle acknowledge the old Jewish divine law*. We cannot avoid having to proclaim the eternal validity of the old law *in some places* of the gospel. We do so all the more joyously, since after completing the christian re-design, we can very well utilise some commands of the old law in our new system (fasting, mess-sacrifice, Sunday-Sabbath). Naturally, these proclamations must remain more in the background in favour of the old law; the proclamation of the new doctrine must stand in the foreground. That we (in the assumed role of the evangelists' plagiarists) create in this manner contradictions in Jesus' doctrine as well, must not concern us as zealous tacticians of the deliberate contradiction.

How to *justify* the necessity of the new morality however, without completely abandoning and exposing the old one? Well, we simply declare that "principally", the new morality does not at all stand in complete opposition to the "law" of Moses, but that it is merely, and correctly understood, the "cleansed, reinstated, correctly interpreted" divine law of the old covenant [sounds like 'Talmud light', for Christians]! Human beings, particularly Pharisees – or so we have Jesus explain – have supposedly, out of ignorance and

malevolence, partially shaped the good, old law materialistically, and partially rendered it more difficult by injunctions. Supposedly, the new doctrine is basically only the necessary reinstatement, or the right "fulfilment", respectively, of the old law. Out of such state of affairs (principle acceptance of the old Jewish law), it again follows necessarily that we must by all means have our invented rabbi Jesus begin his prophet career by addressing his proclamation "for the time being" to *his* people, to his Jewish co-faithfuls. His slogan must (for the time being!) be: I have only been sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And how historically genuine does such slogan sound, and how will this statement of the pious rabbi be perceived by all readers of our fiction now; because such situation appears exceedingly factual and psychologically quite intelligible, in a word: historically genuine. It goes without saying that we have Jesus heavily rail against the Pharisees as the ones muddying and flattening and falsifying the good old law of God.

Again, a difficulty is mounting: as plagiarists, we now stand at a crossroads, as it were. How should we have the Jesus drama unfold further now? Should the Jews *accept or reject* Jesus and the new doctrine? Should we design the further course of the plot so, that Jesus' advertisement among the Jews was a success, or even a great success? Just viewed purely literarily, this would not make for a good drama. And which path we choose is by no means our choice anymore. According to the basic idea of the drama, it is prescribed *which end* Jesus' career is finding and must find: our hero must suffer the death of atonement. Not perhaps by suicide however, but Jesus must *be nailed to the cross* by others, *namely the Jews*! The plot of our fiction must therefore be designed so, that this end on the cross conclusively grows out of the overall situation.

We realise that Jesus must under no circumstance achieve any noteworthy success with his advertisement among "his folk". *After all, his folk must abandon and kill him in the end! Seen on the whole, with his passionate efforts, our prophet must of necessity reap a*

distinct failure with the Jews, particularly with the Jewish leadership (high priests, Pharisees, scribes), he must experience principal rejection. For in the other case, the successful prophet would not be sentenced and executed, but potentially even made a high priest. He must be executed (rejected) however. Our literary task now is: how do we *motivate* the (necessary) harshly condemning attitude of the Jews, especially the Jewish authorities? Very simple: Jesus must forcefully *turn* his compatriots, especially the pious Jews, *into enemies*. How does he achieve this? Among others, we have Jesus and his disciples ostentatiously trespass against some 2nd rate legal regulations, so-called ceremonial regulations. Naturally, as the son of God, our hero is also capable of performing the most spectacular miracle healings. In real life, such deeds in Galilaea and Judaea could only contribute to arousing immense joy and enormous support among all Jews, and to supplying masses of followers to such miracle worker. However, this must happen under no circumstance; Jesus *must* make *enemies*, and especially *with pious Jews*, he *must* arouse offence despite his miracles. Just how is this achieved? We simply have our hero perform many of those healings against the law on the holy Sabbath! This promptly makes for bad blood with all pious ones. What is more, before the eyes of everybody, we have Jesus and the disciples snub the fasting and cleansing commands. If during his healings, the miracle worker (miracle doctor) is now even uttering blasphemous remarks ("*Your sins are forgiven*"), then this will just be too much too soon. This is how we literarily create the necessary enemies. *Literarily*, we have now most formidably "motivated" why this great miracle worker, at the end of his career, has so few real supporters and so terribly many enemies.

Since the Jesus story is meant to sound historically genuine, we still have to accept the necessary objection that despite the disregard for some ceremonial commands, Jesus could potentially find a numerous followership amongst his people, even that his advertisement for the new morality of the Empire of God could perhaps result in an unforeseen success.

Consider, just what this prophet – in our fiction of course! – is capable of and what he does. Not only does he heal uncounted sick, he also shines as a powerful "sorcerer" in some other regards. With a few loaves of bread for example, he feeds 5000 hungry ones! He calms the storm, and even wakes the dead. In that case, in "real" life, some will indulge him in some minor law infringements, and forgive, and – become followers. And just that must under no circumstance happen on a larger scale. *Predominantly the authorities must be and remain Jesus' most embittered enemies*, and may this miracle worker even wake the dead by the thousands! The Pharisees must remain his enemies, because they must by all means – as the literary basic idea is demanding – crucify this Jesus. It would of course be understandable and human, and even most probable in real life, that even Pharisees and scribes would turn to the miracle man with a request, that he may yet heal them or one of their relatives from severe illness. As authors however, we must remain hard, and must principally not allow for our hero to gain friends among the Jewish authorities. (At best, we could have a Nicodemus dispute with Jesus in hiding, at night. And on paper, we can easily mention in passing, quite informally: even many Pharisees believed in him! Such statement looks very good – namely on paper.) No, in principle, it remains: *this* generation of Jews *must* be unfaithful, i.e. confront Jesus with animosity. And yet, we have not eliminated the difficulty, *how* to literarily *motivate* such principal rejection and animosity. There: a glorious idea hits us. As fictionists, we decree the following: the root cause of the Jewish people's essential Jesus animosity is supposedly to be found in a general "impenitence of the soul".

In order to see clearly what is meant by this, we will momentarily reveal yet another, a related, driving force of the dramatic plot.

4. *The impenitence of the Jewish people*

The basic idea obliges us to have Jesus appear in our fiction not only as a real human being (rabbi, prophet), but also, with an equal emphasis, as the "son of God". Again and again, it has to be rammed home with the reader that this human being is indeed God's son as well. So, in the "pneumatic" [inflatable?] John gospel, we have the hero himself then, right from the start without any reservations or shyness, speak out what he actually is: the divine son of a divine father. In the synoptical gospels on the other hand, we have Jesus appear all the more "human", which we also highlight by the fact that the rabbi from Nazareth only reluctantly and hesitantly speaks about his "real" significance. It is a fine literary idea that especially in the Mark gospel, Jesus is at first so reservedly coming forward with his "secret", that instead of him, the "demons" (in the possessed sick [person]) must tell us who this miracle-doing human being is. However, regarding the basic idea, there is a worrying side to the betrayal of the messiah secret by the demons, and the further proclamation by those who have been present during such healing. Just consider that the [attribute of] being-God's-son is visibly emphasised and proven by the fact that this mysterious human being performs deeds (miracles), which only the in the AT prophesied Christ (messiah) can and shall perform. With such state of affairs, there is the fatal possibility that in real life, numerous Jews were helplessly overwhelmed by the power of the wonderful events, and would thus have become faithfuls and followers, had it been quite well-known: this human being is the prophesied messiah. This must not be, and therefore, we are forced, in our fiction within the synoptical framework, to turn the messiah fact into a *messiah secret*. The fact of the God's-son-ness *must not* become *all too obvious* (everywhere in the gospel). Jesus himself must, as far as possible, guard his secret; in the synoptical gospels, he must at first not even hint at who he "actually" is, and if the demons give it away, then he must simply forbid them to do so. (In real life, the subsequent forbidding would of course have been of little use, but it looks quite

good on paper [not really].) If in this way, it is prevented that the people find out who Jesus really is, then we have in return (on paper) averted the danger that the Jews could follow the "messiah" in crowds. For in any case, they must remain his enemies.

We have to further equally prevent that the doctrine of our hero of the coming *Empire of God* is proclaimed all too clearly and distinctly; this again could recruit too many followers. So, if the master speaks of the Empire of God, then he must do this only in the *veiling form of parables*, whose meaning the listeners do not understand, are not *meant* to understand, without further explanation! We have Jesus himself speak it out, that his parables have the conscious purpose to hide, and not perhaps to reveal. The master explains the meaning of the parables only to the disciples; regarding the remaining multitude, he offhand declares: "*Therefore I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand; lest they should turn.*" Jesus speaks so to the disciples (by referring to Isaiah 6,9-10 in doing so) in Mark 4,12 and Matthew 13,13.

So, *in order for crowds of Jews to not become followers*, this is the reason, this is why their hearts are so "impenitent"! It cannot be expressed any more explicitly. Quite rightfully, the reader could still object: actually, it does remain a mystery, why the Jews, with such miracle evidence by his messiahness, have not confessed to Jesus in large masses. After all, he has very easily gained his disciples as faithful followers. We now reveal the deepest root cause of the Jewish people's animosity against their messiah in the "fact" which John has revealed to us. This evangelist declares that supposedly, *God himself* has hardened and made the Jews hearts impenitent! "*He [God; K.] has blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, lest they should... turn...*" (John 12,40) Thus, we have a cause for the animosity of the Jews presented to us, which cannot be shaken by means of reason. However, in order to have pious readers not feel an all-too heavy sorrow over Jesus' "failures", we can consolingly relate to them from the same place in the John gospel [12,42]: "*Nevertheless even among the rulers*

many believed in him, but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue".

If we now take a review of the line of thoughts in this chapter, then already the few discussed examples have us recognise how exceedingly thoroughly the association of the gospel authors have racked their brains over the blueprint of the Jesus fiction and the psychological driving force of the plot mechanism. Truly, it was not an easy task that was to be mastered. Before, behind and above all, the enormous psychological-ethical basic idea was looming: the salvation of sinful and damned mankind by the voluntary sacrificial death of "Christ", the son of God having become a human being, who appeared in the person Jesus, and who had to die on the cross. What did not have to be contemplated and carried out into every detail, in order to have the per se unsolvable conceptional task appear as solved nonetheless; what did not have to be tried, in order to achieve a fairly intelligible plot of the drama. We will hardly be able to deny this medieval circle of philosophers, fictionists and moralists the measure of praise that these men, as artists, deserve without a doubt.

Our focus here is now to once again emphasise that our lighting up of the blueprint and the plot mechanism in the overall gospel proves two things. Firstly, the uniformity of the origin of all gospel scripts is demonstrated once again. The internal uniformity is recognised by the fact – and conditional to the fact – that the entire monstrous volume of the design idea cannot be comprehensively exhausted, emptied, completed in *one* of the four gospels. For its historical-pragmatical-dogmatic design, that is, because of the deliberate contradictions necessary to be included [!], the idea demands *multiple* literary vessels, i.e. multiple partially mutually supplementing, partially mutually cancelling out (contradicting) versions of the overall fiction. Secondly, our investigation, including the exposure of the plot's driving force, proves *the through and through artificial, i.e. fictitious nature of the evangelical "history"*. It is not the case that a natural (historical) action has subsequently been dogmatically infused

and legendised, but after finalising our previous investigations, things are standing clearly visibly so, that *the entire plot, all ongoings up to their innermost driving force*, are set and kept in motion by the literary engine of dogmatic motivation.

VII. The overall gospel as Certificate of Appointment to the clergy

Even by the exposure of the plot's artificial driving forces, the actual secret of the gospels as a literary genre has not been completely unveiled. This will have been achieved only by us discovering the *complete recipe of composition* of the gospel essence. We have a hunch that regarding the actual composition plan of the gospels, a quite certain and completely new content-related basic principle must have been effective, and we will now attempt to establish this. The suitable point of attack is offering itself in the *deliberate contradiction of the christian morality*. In an earlier place, it was discussed why the standard explanations on the contradictory character of the evangelical morality are indefensible, and we have already also partially exposed the *ultimate root cause* of the peculiar discrepancy. We have established that the principal contradictions neverendingly sprout out of the *idea* of Christianity as the *religion of atonement-death-ness* of a divine-son-turned-human-being. The gospel authors owe the foundation and *blueprint* of the structure to this idea.

A literary structure however, still demands a, the foundation matching, cross section part of the whole, the house's storey arrangement. In a house, even in the religion house of Christianity, apartments should be provided; because *in the dwelling*, the actual, *practical purpose* of the building enterprise reveals itself.^{LXIII}

LXIII Dearest Wilhelm, 10 or so pages from the finish line, after 3 volumes – I understand you. Rest in peace.

The practical world purpose of Christianity is embodied in the christian *church*. We could also say: the church is the practised, secularised idea of the christian religion and morality.

The practical world purpose of Christianity! By focusing all our attention on this side of our subject now, we ask: should then the medieval association not also have considered the "practical" things when concerning themselves with the concept of the Jesus fiction? Should it now also be possible to subsequently ascertain the practical *manufacturing recipe of the overall gospel* again?

Let us remember for example Jesus' contradictory statement on *marriage and family*. The reader knows places in the gospels airing harsh statements against family life. "*And everyone who has left houses or brothers or sisters or father or mother or wife or children or lands, for My name's sake, shall receive a hundredfold, and inherit eternal life.*" (Luke 18,2 [not in My KJ, it isn't]; Matthew 19,29) "*Let the dead bury their dead!*" says Jesus to a man who wants to become his disciple, but before wants to pay his father the last honour. There is no harsher word conceivable against the natural family ties than this: "*If anyone comes to Me and does not hate his father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters... he cannot be My disciple.*" (Luke 14,26) [Ouch!] We can understand that over such disrespect, why, condemnation of the love of parents, wives/women and children, some christian hearts are quite upset. There is consolation waiting for them already however: they can refer to other places in the gospel, e.g. Matthew 19,8, where Jesus, in sharp contrast to his previous damnation judgement, not only accepts marriage, but even proclaims the inseparability of the marital ties, in order to extraordinarily strengthen the love of spouses and children by this.

Or let us have a look at Jesus' harsh sayings against the *mammon and possessions*, against worrying over food and drink; remember the rich youngster of whom Jesus has

demanded absolute relinquishment of his possessions, if he wanted to be "perfect" and follow Jesus as a disciple. Again however, those Christians downhearted over such strict speech need not take these demands literally, why, actually, they can quite ignore such unpleasant master's words, because fortunately, there are other, very comforting sayings (such as Matthew 5,42; 6,1 ff.; Luke 12,16 ff.), which by no means condemn possessions and riches, but assume and accept them unchallenged.

Everybody in support of an honest, determined Yes or No on matters of the ethical behaviour that is demanded of them must shake their heads over the fact of the christian contradiction morality [!], provided they insist on the view that the individual contradictions had formed in a "natural" fashion (as the historical result of a primevally christian dogmatic-clerical "development"). The entire course of our previous investigation teaches us by the power of evidence that there can be absolutely no mention of a primevally christian development, because there has been no primeval Christianity.^{LXIV} Despite this realisation of the true origin of the evangelical morality, we cannot blame the reader for being left clueless for the time being. After all, they have good cause to shake their heads over the medieval gospel fictionists now. They can still not quite figure out what could have *caused* these truly not stupid forgers *to split* their "new" *morality in two mutually contradicting demand-halves*. That the contradictions could have snuck in on them "accidentally", is an objection which we do not need to refute once again anew. Oh no, these men knew both what they were doing and what they wanted! A contradiction, that is, just the way it is given in the gospels now, was meant to and had to be expressed in the christian morality in a harsh way. Why? How do we unveil this secret?

LXIV We know what Kammeier means, but there has of course been a "primeval Christianity", only much later, and it looked quite different: as we all know, sword and stake and neverending wars, which is different again from a "Christianity" from several more thousands of years back in time, associated with Odin/Wotan.

The key is handed to us in certain unmistakable clues in some of the "heroic" ethical demands. The secret purpose quite clearly gives itself away for example in the story of the rich youngster in Matthew 19,16 ff. This youngster wants to know of Jesus what good he must do in order to have eternal life. He receives the following answer: if you a) "*want to enter into life*", keep the commandments known to you; if you want to achieve more however, if you "*want to be perfect*", then sell your possessions and give the proceeds to the poor... and *then come and follow after me*. A contradiction is not presented here, but an *increase* of the demands. Jesus' answer goes much further than the young man has requested and expected. He actually only wants information on what good he must do in order to enter life, to become "blessed". Jesus points out the (Jewish) "commandments" to him; Jesus does not leave it at that however, but all of a sudden, he puts a further objective before the youngster's soul: do you want to be perfect? In this case, merely keeping the (ordinary) commands will not suffice, you must then much rather *still do something extraordinary*, give your possessions to the poor and follow me! So, Jesus puts the youngster before the choice to either go the ordinary way (of the *imperfect ones*), or to go the way of the *perfect ones*. To Jesus' regret, the youngster chooses the first way, i.e. he goes back to the worldly life, and contents himself with being an "*ordinary*", *worldly pious one*. According to this, the story does not leave us in any doubt however, what is addressed as identical with "perfection", namely the detachment from the "world" and its conditions, and the unconditional followership and discipleship, whereas this followership is to be understood not spiritually (platonically), but literally. We establish: in Matthew's report, *two levels of Christianity, two ranks, two classes of faithfuls* are distinguished.

This distinction has of course long been known, and it has always been watched and reprimanded. All protestant theologians reprimand Matthew for the fact that with such classification, he had "*introduced a disastrous principle to the christian morality doctrine*".

"The distinction between a lower morality and a higher one", or so they lament, "has then favoured the formation of monkdom in catholicism. By that place [the Matthew chapter], the »consilica evangelica«, the »advice« for those striving for a higher perfection are justified."²⁶² Protestant theology wants to book the perfectionism demand to the account of the primeval Christians or the so-called community legend, respectively. However, we no longer stand in need of even considering the literary-critical "evidence" of this thesis (by layer separation etc.) any longer, for we know that it was not the "primeval Christian" Matthew who has designed the story of the rich youngster, but that the late medieval forgers' association has cooked up this report as well as the fourfold overall gospel. And in the special version of the story in Matthew, the (for protestant Christians so offensive) enhancement and extra demand of the "perfectionism" was incorporated with intent. With the proclamation of the two levels of being christian, the originators of the christian religion reveal the ultimate objective of their efforts: *emphasising and sanctioning a special rank of Christians, a special class of perfect ones*. The medieval gospel authors speak out openly and clearly even on the point, by what this privileged class of the perfect ones are meant to excel, by what they are meant to be distinguished from ordinary Christians: *the perfect ones form a closed covenant of men, whose members have bound themselves to breaking off all connections and bridges to the »world« behind them*. Which parts of the christian faith community are comprised in this covenant of men, is plain to see. They are the (*catholic*) *priesthood*, or to put it more accurately, *monkdom in its professional capacity as priests*.

We have to digress a little in order to clarify which essential relationship exists between monkdom and priesthood. In principal, these two terms should be identical; because according to the determinations of the gospel, the idea of the real-literal succession and discipleship is *purely* expressed only in the *monkpriestdom*. It can be explained so: the term priest aims at the profession, the term monk at the ethical suitability and "social" rank.

Factually however, the principal identity of priesthood and monkdom cannot be kept up in each case (of the perfect discipleship). There are many monks who are no priests, and there are many priests who are no monks. This unavoidable discrepancy in reality is easily explained however, if we consider that the "worldly" priest is of course only a "prevented" monk as it were, i.e. a monk who, by his special professional task, is of necessity prevented from his pure monkdom-only. As such, the perfect discipleship remains connected with the *escape from the world*. If however, Jesus' true successor as a real monk really-literally retires from the world completely, if he no longer cares at all for those living "on the outside", then of course, he is robbed of any possibility *to act upon the world* ('the worldly') *in any way*. It was now by no means the intention of the new religion's originators to keep the perfect ones away from influencing the broad masses of the imperfect ones, to the contrary, in creating the priesthood, they were first and foremost pursuing the purpose of having the "laymen" be lead and ruled by the clerics. (Naturally, the originators themselves belonged to the covenant of men in the most excellent positions.) The assurance of the influence and rule over the laymen – especially this – is the reason why they had to be intent willy-nilly on having a part of the "monks" live and work as world-priests amongst the world-Christians. Always however, the pure monk-priest is and remains the ideal of the true Jesus disciple and the crown of the community calling itself the church. Nonetheless – in a biblical-evangelical regard – the monk-priest is the perfect Christ believer, despite all the lamenting and objections of the non-catholic Christians.

The gospel inventors' task was to present to the mass of the lay-believers the *unconditional necessity of the monk-priest-class*, i.e. to have it appear as "historically" justified through, and tied to, Jesus' authority. This was achieved by the master's known sayings on his "perfect" successors, which we have in part referenced already. With Jesus' occasional, kept generic, utterings regarding the perfect ones however, the far-reaching

purpose, which the originators wanted to realise with the foundation of their covenant of men, was not yet "historically" secured. It turned out to be unavoidable to "historically" anchor more detailed determinations on rank and professional tasks (rights and duties) in the overall gospel. And there, the brilliant thought occurred to the learned association to design the overall gospel so, that the gospel scripts would quite openly, or more or less veiled, respectively, contain the thoroughly sectioned *official, "historically" founded certificate of appointment of the priesthood*. (Besides this, some duties of the lay-faithfuls have also been historicised, albeit to a minute extent.) Through this attribute of the gospels as a historicised "divine" certificate of appointment for the christian priesthood, the peculiar character of the gospel scripts as a literary genre is explained.

Before we dig out and examine the individual articles of the *clerical certificate of appointment* established in the evangelistic literary genre, the long expected question of the "why" of the double morality in Christianity shall finally be dispatched. Catholic theology is of course right, when it – founded upon Jesus' word of the "perfection" of the true disciple and successor – distinguishes *two* types of christian morality: firstly, the morality of those faithfuls who live in the world as *laymen*, and who exercise a civil profession; secondly, the morality of those who want to be perfect (*monks, priests*), and who, besides following the "ordinary" commands, still follow the "evangelical advice" of poverty, chastity (and obedience) for the purpose of achieving perfection. Two classes of believers – two kinds of christian morality: so have the late medieval founders of the new world religion decreed. The question of the root cause for the mysterious discrepancy within the christian morality has found its answer with this statement.

The gospel inventors had themselves guided by the correct and obvious thought, to lend to the from the mass of the faithfuls protruding class of priests a reflection of Christ's holiness, and thus an increased professional dignity by the obligation to a stricter morality,

among others. The layman is meant to see, and honour, in the priest a representative of Christ on Earth; by his special professional morality, emanating a heroic, superhuman character, the monk-priest shows himself worthy of the high honour (reverence) bestowed upon him. (The christian idea decrees so. This is in *practice* by no means opposed to the fact that there are faithfuls amongst the world Christians (laymen) who equally fulfil certain heroic demands out of love for Christ, without parting from family or profession however, who represent a morality of the middle line, as it were.) According to this, it has already become clear for whose benefit the imperatives of the sermon on the mount have been coined. With intent, the description of the heroic morality is preferentially *addressed towards the disciples*. (Matthew 5,1-2) And may it be certain, too, that even the "perfect ones" cannot fulfil the entire justice, cannot fulfil all superhuman demands in practice – because even priests and monks are and remain human beings – this circumstance has been well considered by the learned morality inventors. Even the morally most assiduous and most strict monk should never have a consciousness of being able to achieve salvation by their own efforts. Even the (theoretically) perfect one, like the Christ believer, should always realise their innermost imperfection and weakness. This is the purpose the commands serve, to not resist evil, to love the (every) enemy etc. Other "heroic" commands such as: do not worry about food and drink, are of course easy to follow by the monk who is cared for in the monastery by the community.

Perfect and imperfect faithfuls, priests (monks) and laymen (worldly ones), according to the view of the gospel originators, form the two big, precisely mutually separated ranks or classes of which the christian church community is meant to consist. So, there are two parties living in the house of Christianity (church), one of which (the priesthood) is psychologically and factually the actual owner of the structure. In this, the creation of the priest class as a from the world detached, self-contained covenant of men has been the actual desire of the founders. Now, since the priest class was meant to work as the ruling class, there had to,

necessarily, also be preparations carried out for the creation of a class of subjects, i.e. a faithful mass of laymen as the subjects of the leadership. This acute separation of the faithfuls into two classes may have been deliberately carried out in the gospel fiction, but at the same time, it has also been prudently veiled again, in order to not have the *unity of the overall church* appear jeopardised in the eyes of its followers. Only in a few places of the overall gospel did the forgers have Jesus talk quite openly and unmistakably of the necessity of a from the mass separated class of leaders (in evangelistic language: Jesus' disciples, the apostles). Not in vain does the master make a difference in the gospels between his close discipleship (the "perfect ones") and those who are on the "outside", and not without a certain purpose does he talk to the "outsiders" in parables whose meaning he again only interprets towards his "apostles". In the gospels, not only non-believers are addressed as outsiders, but also the bulk of the believers and followers, inasmuch as they do not count amongst the close, actual, chosen circle of disciples. The circle of the twelve is of course only later extended by Jesus through a special act by a further circle of disciples of a further seventy chosen ones. (Luke 10,1) Like the twelve at first, these seventy are also explicitly decreed to be active members (preachers, priests). (The leadership attribute of the perfect ones is then only fully emphasised and clarified by "historical" examples in the Acts.)

First and foremost because of the clerical civil servanthship has the christian church been called into life by its founders – who, for the best part, are identical with the fiction association who has conceived the overall gospel (and the entire New Testament.) The laymanship was meant to merely form the equally desperately necessary and welcome social understructure of the hierarchy, the passive masses at which the activity of the priests was aimed. (In the foundation of Christianity in the late Middle Ages, not the purely religious, but political-social considerations played the main part.) To intensely demonstrate to the remaining faithfuls the absolute necessity of an official priesthood, had to therefore be a main

concern of the gospel inventors; why, the overall gospel was essentially conceived for the purpose to ongoingly ram the aspect of the necessity of a professional priesthood by "historical" sayings of Jesus home with the passive followers of the new faith. Not only the principal necessity of the priest class, but also the *most excellent rights and duties of its members* were to be established in writing in the "historical" disguise of the overall gospel. To once again condense it to a brief formula: besides those elements representing the as such irrelevant, but in a practical sense indispensable "historical" framework, we have to view the overall gospel as the systematically historicised priests' certificate of appointment, in which the "divine" necessity, the rights and duties of the christian leadership or leading class have been fixed in writing in a "historical" camouflage.

Explained and evidenced by examples, proof now follows, that the "historically" veiled certificate of appointment of the christian clergy lies hidden in the overall gospel. (It changes nothing about this rule that occasionally, desires and duties of the lay-faithful are also considered. In this, it has to be taken into account that the priests at the same time of course, despite their professional capacity, also still remain "faithfuls as such"!)

The overall gospel as the certificate of appointment contains:

1. *The "historical" evidence of the necessity of a special priest class.*

The "sick" need the doctor – obey the priests! Everything they tell you, do and observe. Obey the priests as proclaimers and interpreters of the "word" even if their personal conduct is unworthy. – Priests (scribes) are necessary in order to explain the "mysteries" of the Empire of God. Only the priest (the "church") can correctly interpret the (dark) script. – Priests are necessary as "shepherds" in order to lead the "sheep". Without priest, the faithful wanders about helplessly. – Priests are indispensable, in order to "lawfully officially", i.e. as Christ's representatives on Earth, dispense the sacraments to the faithfuls, and to forgive their sins. –

Priests are necessary, because Jesus himself has clearly demonstrated their necessity by the example of creating a "disciple class".

2. The conditions for admission to the priest class

He who wants to become a priest (monk), must prior to this sever all ties to the "world". For example: he must leave father and mother; he must be prepared to lead the marriage-less life of the "perfect ones"; he must bind himself to poverty and to unconditional followership (obedience) (see tale of the rich youngster and numerous scattered sayings of Jesus in that regard).

3. The self-assessment of the faithful before the intended admission to the clergy ranks

Intense self-scrutinisation is necessary to make oneself's mind up over the "divine" calling to becoming a priest. Example: Jesus in the temptation story. – He who "really" feels called upon (feels addressed by Jesus) shall follow the inner calling without any concerns (see the evangelical calling stories!). – Individual faults before the calling or before admission to the priesthood, respectively, shall represent no obstacle in cases of genuine amendment and repentance having occurred (see Peter's denial, parable of the lost son).

4. The heroic morality of the perfect ones as a professional duty

Main summary of the for the monkpriest valid special professional ethics in the *sermon on the mount*, inasmuch as its commands (as the description of the "new" morality) for the "disciples" (priests) *reach beyond the "ordinary" and more comfortable morality demands* for the worldly bound faithfuls. – No need to despair, even if the "perfect one" is unable to fulfil all of its justice: Jesus himself has not even always followed the (his!) commands. – On the other hand, the perfect one has no cause to become proud and wanton over his "heroic"

performance, either: he cannot continuously keep all commands, anyway. – He who through his belief cannot move "mountains" (is unable to perform "miracles") does – even as a perfect one – not yet have the "right" and full faith.

5. The special professional dignity and professional attributes of the priest

The priest has been installed by God as the shepherd of the faithful herd. He is, as Christ's Earthly representative, the necessary mediator between God and the human beings. He has been granted divine authoritative rights: e.g. to forgive sins. – Heavenly powers are emanating from the priest: mediation of the "spirit" by touch of hand. – The priestly blessing and greeting (Matthew 10,12) does not remain a pious gesture, but has indeed an effect in life; his greeting (according to the evangelical thesis) brings "peace" to the christian house. – The priest's "damnation" also has a "real" effect (even to the plant world); damnation of the infertile fig tree. – The clothing of the perfect one emanates healing power: story of the bleeding woman.^{LXV}

6. The priestly official actions

The priestly office is mission and privilege at the same time. "*Go out into all the world...!*" The "mercy" is tied to the cultish act of the sacraments, and the sacraments are tied to the priest, a) *the Lord's supper*, derived from and "historically" founded upon the reports of the institution. It has long been recognised that the tales of the wonderful feedings also aim at the eucharistic secret. However, it has so far not been realised that the meaning of the feeding stories is to be found in the miracle of the remainder (of many baskets of bread). Referred to is the eucharistic food in its attribute of being multiplied unlimited by the blessing of the priest, in such a way that despite consuming it, there is always some left. Furthermore, the

LXV orig.: "blutflüssiges Weib"; sorry, 4 pages from the end, and I refuse to scan the entire NT for that one line of this 'story' just to find out what the correct translation should be. Many of you probably know the relevant place, anyhow.

story of the wedding to Kana belongs here. It is founded upon the following sacramental meaning: as much as Jesus has the power to turn water into wine, he can also further turn wine into blood (through the "disciples" authorised by him). – b) Official act of the *baptism*, baptism ordered through the priests. Jesus (and the disciples) themselves have already baptised; Jesus was baptised himself. – c) Teaching office of the priest class or the "church", respectively. "Teach them!" Interpretation of the script. Preaching of the word. Advertisement for the Empire of God. – d) *Forgiving of sins* through the authorised priest. "*What you will solve on Earth, shall be solved in heaven.*" The tale of the healing of the paralytic contains Jesus' example and the authorisation of his perfect successors: God has, through Jesus, bestowed such powers upon "human beings" (to forgive sins on Earth). The story of the [female] sinner (Luke 7,49) also "proves" the fact of the already on Earth possible sin-forgiving. e) Gift of *healing the sick*. Jesus' example and authorisation of the "disciples" to drive out demons, to heal the sick.

7. Special rights, advantages and duties of the priest

The perfect one who has left the world behind him (the monk) will find again in his new community (monastery: "*in this present time*") multiplied that which he had abandoned. His spiritual co-brothers form his "family" now. In the new community, the individual needs not worry about clothing and food, it is unnecessary to collect earthly treasures etc. In cases of squabbles amongst the "brothers" of the clerical covenant of men, the case shall be settled (without calling upon worldly courts!) internally: clerical judicature, which is in practice to be extended to the remaining faithfuls if possible. In case of persecution, persevere and confess. However, be smart like the snakes as well; you may potentially withdraw from looming lethal danger by fleeing from it. Defense with arms is also permitted (see Luke 22,36). None amongst the priest-brothers may raise claims to a special or even privileged position or a "rank" in the covenant of men. Much rather, the last and modest ones shall

become the "first". Practice humility and serve each other! The perfect one (like the other faithfuls) will receive the last "reward" for his special efforts ("heroic" deeds, relinquishments) in heaven, but just because of his special efforts and his rank's dignity, in heaven as well, the priest (monk) is privileged over the "blessed laymen" and will receive certain positions of honour. Tax exemption for priests! Priests may take part in family festivities of the worldly faithfuls. They are permitted to drink wine (wedding to Kana). Failures in healing attempts are to be blamed on the lack of faith of the priests themselves or that of the sick or their relatives, respectively, or they occur because the involved parties (priest and sick one) have not prepared by sufficiently praying and fasting.

8. Regulations for the "church"

For the "holy" (the church), no expense is too precious or even prohibited. Whatever is granted for the equipment of the church buildings or the livelihood of the priests, can with a calm conscience be extracted from the poor: story of the anointing of Jesus. – The church is the house of "God", and it must potentially be kept pure by force: temple cleansing. Enemies of the "church" cannot expect love and mercy! (see Luke 19/27, among others) "Huts", i.e. churches are preferentially to be built in places where faithfuls had apparitions of "saints": story of Jesus' transfiguration. – In the interest of the "church" (the priesthood), a deliberate split in the family is permitted: Luke 12,51f.

9. Relationship of the priest class (the "church") to the state

One has to obey God (the church) more than the humans. Nobody can serve two masters. Be submissive towards the authorities that have power over you (if they have the power!). Tax exemption for clerics: Matthew 17,26. On the other hand: give to the Emperor what is the Emperor's. –

This collection of evidence, which is far from being complete, but can be extended, clearly shows that indeed in the mass of tales of the overall gospel, that is, in many individual parts (legal articles) wildly scattered across the whole, there lay hidden a "certificate of appointment" for the christian priesthood rich in "official" regulations. All we have to do (as has happened above), is to collect the cut up parts and scattered rags, arrange them by legal articles, and we hold in our hands the original script. Does it have to be emphasised once again, that this state of affairs has not come about by chance, that it has not "crept in" "accidentally" during the conception of the gospel fiction, but that establishing the individual "decrees" in the literary essence has been intended, and has been carried out with thorough contemplation? Now, from the fact that the legal articles of the chopped up document, put together in order again, by far make for the bulk of the gospel, follows the conclusion that historicising the for the "perfect ones" relevant "divine" decrees has been the main purpose of the literary action. Further objectives, as has been said before, were of course not ruled out. Thus, it is an easy undertaking to extract another portion of the overall mass, in which admonitions, words of consolation, edifying scenes are offered for the desire of the faithfuls, i.e. the *priests and laymen combined*. The necessity of a *female* class of Christians of "perfect ones" has also been "historically" justified, e.g. the story of Mary and Martha. So, all reports, events and admonitions, decrees, statements of the overall gospel in their practical interpretation and usage are to be understood and realised *ideally literally*. The gospel may pretend to be precipitation of "history", but the purpose of its existence is not to hand down history, but to constitute and present the law book of the christian priesthood (the "church") in a historically veiled form and disguise.

Thus, the manufacturing secret of the "historical" gospel essence has become obvious, and the problem has been solved, why the "biography" of the founder of the christian religion, regarding form and content in its design, so peculiarly sets itself apart from the

contemporary prototypes. The peculiar purpose of becoming the historicised law book of the new church has caused the peculiar literary dressing of the overall gospel. It also becomes clear now that not for example the astral view has been the main focus of the gospel inventors. Much rather, astral and similar motifs and inspirations have played only a very minor part in the design of the gospels. However, the inventors took inspirations and examples from wherever they found such things – so from the OT as well, from the Jewish, Greek and Indian world of thought [but mainly from the history of Atlantis, really] – but these borrowed motifs find usage only as welcome tools in the construction of the fiction; the main driving force was given by the originators' basic intention to draw up a historically camouflaged certificate of appointment for the priesthood. All further intentions had to stand back for this main purpose. The historic disguise was chosen because it went without saying that the "divine" law book of the church was decreed by the "founder" of the new religion, i.e. that the individual decrees had to originate with Jesus himself. The new, by the originators thought up, philosophy religion (philosophy in disguise with religious terminology!) was therefore presented as the story of Jesus of Nazareth. They had realised that the story was representing the most suitable, because as a "fact" indisputable, and at the same time as a tale, the most vivid appearing form of the legislation, especially if the story was presenting itself as one in which God directly, or much rather, God's son, was the main character. At the same time, the holy story is of course also meant to be understood historically, and as genuine tradition, it shall deliver proof that Jesus really was a "historical" person. The gospel is simply meant to proclaim a doctrine in the form of history. In detail, the procedure unfolded so, that for each regulation of the priest law book that was considered necessary, a short story suitable for it was thought up. According to the in the gospels existing topographic-chronological aspects, the short stories were then arranged successively along the plot thread in a fourfold fashion.

Finally, we summarise the *results of our investigation* on the effective principles in the concept of the overall gospel in a few brief sentences. The religious basic idea (salvation idea) has delivered the actual "historical" core and the backbone of the Jesus drama. The idea itself, out of itself, has necessarily provided the main driving forces for the mechanism of the plot. Wondrous beginning and tragic ending of the founder's historical career – the birth and childhood stories as well as the reports about the trial, crucifixion and resurrection, furthermore the category of the miracle tales as proof for the divinity of the human being Jesus, had been immediately given to the gospel fictionists as the elements of the salvation idea. In the framework designed by the basic idea, the second effective construction principle was the intention of the founders of the christian religion to draw up the historicised legal articles of a certificate of appointment for the priesthood. A third principle – consideration for the desires of the laymen – is only of little significance for the concept of the Jesus fiction. The same goes for further principles, such as e.g. the astral viewpoint, all of which have only occasionally found usage as tools in the construction of the overall gospel.

After thoughts (and off topics)

The OT (Tora, Pentateuch, first five books of Moses plus prophets, first covenant, what have you?) is virtually an *exclusively Jewish* affair (moulded after Northern/Western (Atlantis) original history); it's always "*Jewish law*" this and "*Jewish God*" that and "*Jewish authorities*" something else – after all, it is *Jewish 'written law'*, read front to end in each synagogue on Earth once every year from a Tora roll, without leaving out one 'iota' – to this moment on, and forever etc. It's a compilation of just about every crime 'in the book', overloaded with cruelty beyond human conception, mostly engaged in by this petty, jealous, insecure and by no means benevolent alleged 'god' (Satan) who promises everything to 'his chosen people' if they do as they're told, e.g. make his "sword drunk from blood" of non-Jews. The writing 'style' is designed to cause sleepiness, confusion, mental paralysis, and is also all over...

...the NT: this is a *mostly Jewish* affair (apart from the fact that all of it has been drawn from our Northern/Western (Atlantis) history, and mangled to suit his/their agenda/image); it's always "*Jewish law*" this and "*Jewish God*" that and "*Jewish authorities*" something else – here however, the *ruling* Romans are generously (and gratuitously) permitted to ask the Jewish 'synedrion's' council on matters more or less important to Jewish folk, to endure the hour-long rants/letters of some Jewish putz or another, and even to *join* this "new Jewish religion", among a great many other unbelievabilities.

It may also well be worth investigating (by somebody smarter than me) what the significance of the mere fivethousand-sevenhundred-and-eighty-something years on the Jewish calendar actually mean. What is this? In a world of cultures reaching back tens of thousands of years, what actually is Judaism?

Kammeier appears to not have quite realised, that a considerable proportion of the 'authors' he references (in the two other volumes as well) have names peculiar to Jewish folk

(e.g. Hirsch, Zucker, Zahn, Adam, Dalman, Strauss, Eichhorn etc. pp. ad inf.), i.e. those that have chiefly effected the manifestation of all those contradictive (biblical as well as 'scientific', actually) ongoings, and who keep maintaining it.

(Whenever you encounter 'the style', it's either them, or one of their helpers, 'innocent' or not; e.g. a character calling himself 'Govbudhudnut' or so, who, on certain German items, patronises archive.org visitors with his self-righteous fantasy drivell in extremely poor taste (being literarily 'creative' in the face of tens of millions people killed), seems to be an 'innocent' one, i.e. he just believes everything mainstream.)

Kammeier, although he had nailed that puppy flat to the wall over and over again for three volumes in 13 individual books across more than 30 years by that time (see also footnote 41 and the various instances of [!] in the running text), also appears to not have realised that the tactics of **the deliberate contradiction is no means, but the actual end.**

- The automatically resulting artificial problems have no natural solution, after all. You must be made to feel stupid for not quite 100% understanding, where there is nothing to *be* understood.

- The contradictive nature of the narrative gives the priesthood an all-encompassing arbitrariness wildcard over the layfolk, i.e. the rest of the population.

This is how people are rendered bamboozled and stupefied at first, and ultimately stupid and superstitious – we are easier to control in that state.

The idea in modern language: *How do we screw them up so badly, that they don't know whether they're boy or girl anymore?*

This is also how to sow disunion.

Between races, 'religions', nations, generations, ultimately right down to each individual (divide and conquer!); the way we have it latest since 'smart' phones and 'covid'. Also, let's

not forget the resulting epochal waste of time. Historicity has very little to do with it on the whole, rather its opposite if anything, i.e. to gradually render unhistorical just about everything.

The use of much, much older Northern/Western elements (the birthday, the wound, character traits, the cross, Midnight Mountain (now Sinai), the psalms, or so I hear, etc.) has likely made the shift from North/West to East/South more palatable to the Northern/Western 'users' which, in the process, we have been turned into by way of sword and stake. (**The monster lie: "ex oriente lux" = "from the Orient (East/South) [comes] the light [of civilisation]"**)

This transition has essentially seen tens of thousands of years of our original Northern/Western history wiped out comprehensively, while that concoction of contradictions (bible) leaves us everlastingly at unease **and to think: we once worshipped nature and its eternal laws as Pagans who did not *believe*, but *know*!**

And right now, we *know* next to nothing anymore, but *believe* that for example 'covid' and 'global warming' are actual things, that Muslims brought down the twin towers, and that this '6 million' bunk is indeed any more real than what we've been through just then with this NT bollocks.

A terrible development has long found its conclusion: already so many generations of us human beings have not shown any interest in what happened before our birth, i.e. history. High time to fundamentally turn this around, it's a matter of our survival (see *Reminder from the Past*).

Always remember: the bigger the headline, the bigger the lie behind it!

(... and I look around the room, the neighbourhood, the world and ultimately conclude: THIS IS ALL WRONG!)

Is it really necessary to point out, that authorship of the Koran is claimed by the same people who came up with this bible bilge. Who will tell the Muslims that it's all lies, and that they once were like we once were Aryan Pagans? I think **S Rushdie** may have tried that in ***The Satanic Verses***. Oh well...

Anyway, show me a two-class society (priests v all the rest), and I show you the same origin every time – it's the one we cannot see lest we die, aided by his 'chosen' people, and, spearheaded by those, freemasonry, i.e. secret societies which additionally incorporate non-Jewish (goy) 'useful idiots'/traitors, without whom none of this would work at all.

Now, let us wash the dirt away, each for themselves for starters, i.e.

- **go offline** (use your own head and eyes and ears instead of a 'smart' phone)
 - **stay there** (except perhaps, on the outside, for essential communications such as e.g. downloading the 'NSL Archiv' by 'unglaublichkeiten.com', a 162 GB library/phono/video archive – it's priceless (German: "unbezahlbar" = "unpayable"!))
 - **avoid the entire mainstream** (TV, radio, papers, film, contemporary 'music' etc.)
 - **pay cash** when purchasing stuff
- (- see yourself by what you *are*, instead of what you *have*, and see how this pans out)

If everybody did this for as short a timespan as only one single day, it would coax the foxes out of their burrows, and in no time at all, this whole shit-show that our world has become would be over for good, and we could start rediscovering ourselves (our true divine mission).



Literature Index

- 1 Theologische Literaturzeitung [Theological Literature Periodical], 1953, column 78
- 2 Theologische Literaturzeitung 1953, column 423
- 3 R. Bultmann in »Neues Testament und Mythologie« (in Kerygma und Mythos, 1941, 2. Aufl. [2nd edition] 1952, p 46f.)
- 4 Die Christliche Welt [The Christian World], 1905, columns 642–643
- 5 Arthur Drews – Das Markusevangelium als Zeugnis gegen die Geschichtlichkeit Jesu, 2. Aufl. 1928, S. 6 [The Gospel of Mark as Testimony against Jesus' Historicity, 2nd edition, p 6]
- 6 H. Windisch – Das Problem Der Geschichtlichkeit Jesu (zit. nach Theol. Rundschau, 1930, S. 248f.) [The Problem of the Historicity of Jesus, quoted after Theological Periodical, p 248 f.]
- 7 A. Drews, *ibid*, p 46
- 8 A. Drews, *ibid*, p 42
- 9 A. Drews, *ibid*, p 43
- 10 A. Drews, *ibid*, p 37
- 11 K. Aland – Das Johannesevangelium auf Papyrus (in: Forschungen und Fortschritte, Nr. 31 (1957), S. 50) [The Gospel of John on Papyrus (in: Research and Progress), p 50]
- 12 H. Conzelmann, Die geographischen Vorstellungen im Lukasevangelium (Diss. Tübingen, Besprechung in Theol. Literaturzeitung, 1953, S. 690f.) [The Geographical Ideas in the Gospel of Luke (Dissertation Tübingen, Review in Theological Literature Periodical, p 690 f.)]
- 13 Fr. G. Kenyon – Der Text der griechischen Bibel, 1952, S. 123 [The Text of the Greek Bible, p 123]
- 14 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 48
- 15 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 12
- 16 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 12
- 17 W. Schubert – Einführung in die Papyruskunde, 1918, S. 10 [Introduction to Papyrology, p 10]
- 18 K. Preisendanz – Papyruskunde und Papyrusforschung, 1933, S. 341 [Papyrology and Papyrus Research, p 341]
- 19 Preisendanz, *ibid*, p 180
- 20 Preisendanz, *ibid*, p 182
- 21 Preisendanz, *ibid*, p 142
- 22 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 12
- 23 Aland in: Forschungen und Fortschritte, 1957, S. 50 [Research and Progress, p 50]
- 24 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 14
- 25 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 199

- 26 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 199
- 27 Aland, *ibid*, p 51
- 28 Aland, *ibid*, p 51
- 29 Wissenschaftliche Annalen, 2 (1953), S. 255 [Scientific Annals, p 255]
- 30 Preisendanz, *ibid*, p 115
- 31 Preisendanz, *ibid*, p 113
- 32 Preisendanz, *ibid*, p 132
- 33 Preisendanz, *ibid*, p 117
- 34 Aland, *ibid*, p 53
- 35 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 17
- 36 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 17
- 37 D Traube – Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen, Bd. 2, 1911, S. 64 (Lectures and Treatises, Vol. 2, p 64)
- 38 Traube, *ibid*, p 125
- 39 Traube, *ibid*, p 133
- 40 Traube, *ibid*, p63
- 41 G. L. Vollmann – Handbuch der Einleitung in sämtliche Bücher des Neuen Testaments, 1800, S. 123
[Handbook of the Introduction to all the Books of the New Testament, p 123]
- 42 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 49
- 43 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 49 f.
- 44 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 50
- 45 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 50
- 46 E Nestle – Einführung in das griechische Alte Testament, 3. Aufl., 1909, S. 219 [Introduction to the Greek Old Testament, p 219]
- 47 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 53
- 48 S. Teiss – Der Kodex D in der Apostelgeschichte, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristl. Literatur, Bd. 17, 1899, S. 5 [Codex D in the Acts. Texts and Investigations on the History of the early Christian Literature, Vol. 17, p5]
- 49 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 51
- 50 R Knopf – Einführung in das Neue Testament, 2. Aufl., 1923, S. 38 [Introduction to the New Testament, 2nd edit., p 38]
- 51 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 55

- 52 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 85
- 53 Thüringische Landeszeitung vom 22.12.1956 [Thuringian Regional paper]
- 54 Aland, *ibid*
- 55 L van Ess – Pragmatisch-kritische Geschichte der Vulgata, 1824, S. 6f. [Pragmatic-critical History of the Vulgata, p 6 f.]
- 56 Knopf, *ibid*, p 31
- 57 A Pott – Der Text des Neuen Testaments, 1906, S. 12 [The Text of the New Testament, p12]
- 58 Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen, 1923, S. 13 [Göttingen Learned Notices, p13]
- 59 P Feine – Jesus, 1930, p 233
- 60 Feine-Behm – Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 8. Aufl. 1936, S. 21 [Introduction to the NT, 8th edit., p 21]
- 61 E Fascher – Textgeschichte als hermeneutisches Problem, 1953 [Text History as a Problem of Hermeneutics]
- 62 Nestle, *ibid*, p 2 f.
- 63 Bleek-Mangold – Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 1886, S. 900 [Introduction to the NT, p 900]
- 64 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 154
- 65 Forschungen und Fortschritte, 31, 1957, p 51 [see note 23]
- 66 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 155
- 67 Kenyon, *ibid*, p 120
- 68 F Kattenbusch – Die deutsche evangelische Theologie seit Schleiermacher, 5. Aufl., 1926, S. 137 [The German Evangelical Theology since Schleiermacher, 5th edit., p 137]
- 69 H Stephan – Geschichte der evangelischen Theologie, 1938, S. 241 [History of the Evangelical Theology, p 241]
- 70 Kattenbusch, *ibid*, p 120
- 71 Die christliche Welt, 1905, Sp. 773 [The Christian World, column 773]
- 72 Th Zahn – Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 2. Bd, 3. Aufl., 1907, S. 411 [Introduction to the NT, vol. 2, 3rd edit., p 411]
- 73 Besprechung von E. M. Roloff – Im Lande der Bibel, in: Theolog. Literaturzeitung, 1923, S. 130 [Review by E M Roloff – In the Land of the Bible, in: Theological Literature periodical, p130]
- 74 Zahn, *ibid*, p 444
- 75 K Adam – Jesus Christus, 3. Aufl., 1934, S. 85 [3rd edit., p 85]
- 76 Rezension von Alex. Beyer, Der Menschensohn, in: Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1925, S. 10 [review of Alex Beyer – The Son of Man, in Theological Literature Periodical, p10]

- 77 W Kammeier – Die Wahrheit über die Geschichte des Spätmittelalters, Wobbenbüll 1979, Teil 5, S. 18f. [The Truth of the History of the Late Middle Ages, part 5, p 18 f. – However, how Kammeier in '1957', the time he finished this here work, could reference this in '1979' published work is quite beyond me.]
- 78 R Bultmann – Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, 1921
- 79 Jülicher–Fascher – Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 7th Edit., 1931, p 359
- 80 H Felder – Jesus Christus, II, 1921, p 404, 406
- 81 M Maurenbrecher – Von Jerusalem nach Rom, 1910, S. 93 [From Jerusalem to Rome, p 93]
- 82 Bultmann, ibid, p 140
- 83 M Dibelius – Die Botschaft von Jesus Christus, 1935, S. 128/29 [The Message of, p 128/9]
- 84 Bultmann, ibid, p 34 f.
- 85 O Perels – Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 4. Folge, Heft 12, 1934, S. 89 [The Miracle Tradition of the Synoptists, Contributions to the Science of the Old and New Testament, 4th installment, booklet 12, p 89]
- 86 Fascher, ibid, p 60
- 87 Fascher, ibid, p 77 f.
- 88 Bultmann, ibid, p 5
- 89 W Haupt – Worte Jesu und Gemeindeüberlieferung, 1913, S. 149 [Saying of Jesus and Community tradition, p 149]
- 90 Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1910, S. 144 [Periodical for Scientific Theology, p 144]
- 91 E Wendling – Entstehung des Markus–Evangeliums, 1908, S. 56 [Origin of Mark's Gospel, p56]
- 92 V O Janssen – Der literarische Charakter des Lukas–Evangeliums, Diss., Jena, 1917, S.
38 [The Literary Character of Luke's Gospel, p 38]
- 93 K L Schmidt – Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, 1919, S. 39 [The Framework of Jesus' History, p 39]
- 94 V Martl – Die Hypothese einer einjährigen Wirksamkeit Jesu, Neutestamentliche Ab–handlungen, 1917 [The Hypothesis of Jesus' One-year working, New-Testamentarian Treatices]
- 95 H J Gladder – Unsere Evangelien, 1919, S. 206ff. [Our Gospels, p 206 ff.]
- 96 Schmidt, ibid, p 52
- 97 G Dalman – Orte und Wege Jesu, 3. Aufl. 1924, S. 401 [Places and Paths of Jesus, 3rd edit., p 401]
- 98 M Maurenbrecher – Von Nazareth nach Golgatha, 1909, S. 44 [From ...to..., p 44]
- 99 Schwelger – Nachapostolisches Zeitalter, 1. Bd., S. 90 [Post-Apostolian Age, p 90]
- 100 Gfrörer – Die heilige Sage, 1838 [The Holy Legend]

- 101 Jülicher–Fascher, *ibid*, p 428, 437
- 102 Bruno Bauer – Die Apostelgeschichte, 1850, S. 58 [The Acts]
- 103 Joh. Weiß – Das Lukasevangelium–Die Schriften des Neuen Testamentes, 1. Bd., 1906, S. 475 [The Gospel of Luke – The Writings of the New Testament, Vol. 1, p 475]
- 104 Bernh. Weiß – Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas, 9. Aufl. 1901, S. 221 [The Gospels of Mark and Luke, 9th edit., p 221]
- 105 E Klostermann – Das Markusevangelium, 2. Aufl. 1926, S. 169 [The Gospel of Mark, 2nd edit., p 169]
- 106 Adam, *ibid*, p 237
- 107 C Weizsäcker – Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche, 2. Aufl., 1890, S. 22 [The Apostolian Era of the Christian Church, 2nd edit., p 22]
- 108 Joh. Weiß – Das Urchristentum, 1917, S. 63/64 [Primeval Christianity, p 63/64]
- 109 Th. Zahn – Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas, 1. Bd., 3. Aufl. 1922, S. 119 [The Acts of Luke, Vol.1, 3rd edit., p 119]
- 110 M Baumgarten – Die Apostelgeschichte, 1. Teil, 1852, S. 86 [The Acts, Pt. 1, p 86]
- 111 Joh. Weiß – Urchristentum, *ibid*, p 124
- 112 Weizsäcker, *ibid*, p 23
- 113 Weizsäcker, *ibid*, p 25
- 114 R Knopf – Einführung in das Neue Testament, 3rd edit., 1930, p 293
- 115 J G Eichhorn – Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 1804 [Introduction to ...]
- 116 H J Holtzmann – Die synoptischen Evangelien, ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter, 1863, und Lehrbuch der historisch–kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 1885 [The Synoptical Gospels, their Origin and Historical Character and Textbook of the Historical-Critical Introduction to the New Testament]
- 117 R Knopf – Einführung in das Neue Testament, 2. Aufl., 1923, S. 110 [2nd edit., p 110]
- 118 E C Hoskyns – Das Rätsel des Neuen Testaments, 1938, p 72
- 119 G Volkmar – Die Evangelien oder Markus und die Synopsis, 1870 [The Gospels, or Mark and the Synopsis]
- 120 C G Wilke – Der Urevangelist, 1836 [The Primeval Evangelist]
- 121 Bruno Bauer – Kritik der evang. Geschichte der Synoptiker, 1841/42 [Critique of the evang. History of the Synoptists]
- 122 Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1881, S. 599 ff. [Theological Studies and Critiques, p 599 ff.]
- 123 J Schmid – Matthäus und Lukas, in: Bibl. Studien, Vol. 23, 1930, p 71
- 124 P Wernle – Die synoptische Frage, 1899 [The Synoptical Question]

- 125 Wernle, *ibid*, p 140
- 126 F Godet – Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Part 2, 1. Dptmt., 1905, p 368
- 127 A Jülicher – Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p 219 a. 228
- 128 Wernle, *ibid*, p 11
- 129 Wernle, *ibid*, p 25
- 130 Wernle, *ibid*, p 14
- 131 Feine–Behm, a.a.O., S. 106
- 132 J Weiß – Die drei älteren Evangelien (Schriften des Neuen Testaments, herausg. v. Bousset, 1. Bd. 4. Aufl. 1929, S. 33) [The Three Older Gospels (NT scripts, publ. by Bousset, Vol. 1, 4th edit., p 33)]
- 133 Bleek–Mangold – Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 1886, p 301
- 134 W Heitmüller – Das Johannesevangelium (Schriften des Neuen Testaments, 3. Aufl., 1918, S. 12) [The Gospel of John (Scripts of the NT, 3rd edit., p 12)]
- 135 W Larfeld – Die neutestamentlichen Evangelien nach ihrer Eigenart und Abhängigkeit, 1925, S. 366 [The New-Testamentarian Gospels by their Nature and Dependency, p 366]
- 136 Heitmüller, *ibid*, p 13
- 137 Heitmüller, *ibid*, p 13
- 138 Schmid, *ibid*, p 70
- 139 Schmid, *ibid*, p 171
- 140 Feine–Behm, *ibid*, p 26
- 141 J Schniewind – Zur Synoptiker–Exegese, in: Theol. Rundschau, 1930, S. 149 [On the Synoptists' Exegesis, in: Theol. Review, p 149]
- 142 Schniewind, *ibid*, p 141
- 143 Schniewind, *ibid*, p 148
- 144 Feine–Behm, *ibid*, p 33
- 145 W Bußmann – Synoptische Studien, Heft 3, S. 37 [Synoptical Studies, Book 3, p 37]
- 146 Larfeld, *ibid*, p 79
- 147 Schmid, *ibid*, p 35
- 148 Schmid, *ibid*, p 59
- 149 Schmid, *ibid*, p 73

- 150 Schmid, *ibid*, p 73
- 151 Schmid, *ibid*, p 180
- 152 M. Maurenbrecher – Von Jerusalem nach Rom, 1910, S. 11 [From Jerusalem to Rome, p 11]
- 153 W Wendling – Die Entstehung des Markus–Evangeliums, 1908 [The Origin of the Gospel of Mark]
- 154 Wendling, *ibid*, p 215
- 155 Wendling, *ibid*, p 219
- 156 Wendling, *ibid*, p 223
- 157 Wendling, *ibid*, p 190
- 158 Wendling, *ibid*, p 221
- 159 Wendling, *ibid*, p 5 a. 57
- 160 Wendling, *ibid*, p 16
- 161 Wendling, *ibid*, p 40
- 162 Wendling, *ibid*, p 33
- 163 Wendling, *ibid*, p 26
- 164 Wendling, *ibid*, p 67
- 165 Wendling, *ibid*, p 16
- 166 Wendling, *ibid*, p 40
- 167 Wendling, *ibid*, p 114
- 168 Feine–Behm, *ibid*, p 33
- 169 R Thiel – Drei Markusevangelien, 1938, S. 7 [Three Gospels of Mark, p 7]
- 170 Thiel, *ibid*, p 64
- 171 Thiel, *ibid*, p 65
- 172 Thiel, *ibid*, p 90, 106
- 172a Thiel, *ibid*, p 69
- 173 Thiel, *ibid*, p 93
- 174 Thiel, *ibid*, p 66
- 175 E Hirsch – Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums, 1. Buch (Das Werden des Markus–Evangeliums), 2. Buch (Die Vorlagen des Lukas und das Sondergut des Matthäus), 1941 [Early History of the Gospel, Book 1 (The

- 176 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 56
- 177 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 197
- 178 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 192
- 179 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 29
- 180 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 28
- 181 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 35
- 182 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 36
- 183 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 66
- 184 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 100 [the German original has the page as "1%" – blasted scanner 'soft' ware]
- 185 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 40
- 186 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 90
- 187 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 31
- 188 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 241, 243
- 189 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 190
- 190 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 190
- 191 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 192; this endnote is missing in the running text of the German original, so as to not upset things, I've put it in the place that seemed the most likely to me.
- 192 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 190
- 193 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 210
- 194 Hirsch, *ibid*, vol. 2, p 365
- 195 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 5
- 196 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 5
- 197 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 4
- 198 see end of chapter 5
- 199 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 10
- 200 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 10
- 201 Hirsch, *ibid*, vol. 2, p 372

- 202 Hirsch, *ibid*, p 211
- 203 Hirsch, *ibid*, vol. 1, p 34
- 204 W Erbt – Der Anfänger unseres Glaubens, 1930, p 7 [The Starter of our Belief]
- 205 A Hausrath – Richard Rothe und seine Freunde, Bd. II, 1906, S. 533/34 [... and his Friends, Vol. II, p 533/34]
- 206 M E Winkel – Der Sohn, 1935, p 46 [The Son]
- 207 Winkel, *ibid*, p 43
- 208 Winkel, *ibid*, p 337
- 209 Winkel, *ibid*, p 121
- 210 Winkel, *ibid*, p 441
- 211 Winkel, *ibid*, p 417
- 212 Winkel, *ibid*, p 419
- 213 Winkel, *ibid*, p 422 a. 423
- 214 J Hoh – Die Lehre des hl. Irenäus über das Neue Testament, in: Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 1919 [The Teaching of the... on the NT]
- 215 has not even been used in the German original – sorry.
- 216 Sickenberger in: P Dausch – Die drei älteren Evangelien, 1918, p 49 [The Three Older Gospels]
- 217 E Meyer – Ursprung u. Anfänge des Christentums, Vol. I, 1921, p 237 [Origin and beginning of Christianity]
- 218 Feine–Behm – Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 8th Edit., 1936, p 61
- 219 Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, publ. by Bousset a. Heitmüller, Vol. I, 4th edit., 1929, p 35 [The Writings of the NT]
- 220 Jülicher-Fascher – Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 7th edit. 1931
- 221 O Pfleiderer – Das Urchristentum, Vol. I, 2nd edit., p 403 [Primeval Christianity]
- 222 B Bacon – The Gospel of Mark (see Theol. Literaturzeitung, 1932, p 30)
- 223 W Wrede – Das Messiasgeheimnis, 2nd edit., 1913, p 6 [The Messiah Secret]
- 224 H Felder - Jesus Christus, Vol. II, 1921, p 399
- 225 R Otto - Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, 2nd edit., 1940, p 73 [Kingdom of God and Son of Man]
- 226 Die Christliche Welt, 1910, col. 150 [The Christian World]
- 227 J Grimm - Die Einheit der vier Evangelien, 1868, p 29 [The Union of the four Gospels]

- 228 J Schmid - Matthäus und Lukas, in Bibl. Studien, Vol. 23, 1930, p 205
- 229 K.L. Schmidt - Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, 1919, p 261 [The Framework of the History of Jesus]
- 230 G Dalman - Orte und Wege Jesu, 3rd edit., 1924, p 331 [Places and Paths of Jesus]
- 231 Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1924, p. 535 [Theological Literature Magazine]
- 232 W. Bauer - Das Johannes–Evangelium, 3rd edit., 1933, p 215
- 233 Die christliche Welt, 1905, col. 639 [The Christian World]
- 234 P. Feine - Jesus, 1930, p 83
- 235 Theolog. Literaturblatt, 1934, col. 213
- 236 W Larfeld - Die neutestamentlichen Evangelien nach ihrer Eigenart und Abhängigkeit, 1930, p 27/28 [The New-testamentarian Gospels by their Nature and Dependency]
- 237 W. Larfeld, *ibid*, p 193
- 238 W. Larfeld, *ibid*, p 235
- 239 W. Larfeld, *ibid*, p 218
- 240 Theolog. Rundschau, 1930, p 232
- 241 M. Werner - Die Entstehung des Christlichen Dogmas, 1941, p 50 [The Creation of the Christian Dogma]
- 242 P. Feine - Theologie des Neuen Testaments, 6th edit., 1934, p 97
- 243 P. Feine, *ibid.*, p 103
- 244 P. Feine, *ibid.*, p 104
- 245 Werner, *ibid.*, p 486
- 246 K Holl - Gesammelte Aufsätze, Vol. III, 1928, p 536 [Collected Essays]
- 247 M Fascher - Vom Verstehen des Neuen Testaments, 1930, p 30 [Of the Understanding of the ...]
- 248 E Meyer - Ursprung u. Anfänge des Christentums, Vol. I, 1921, p 53 [Origin and Beginnings of Christianity]
- 249 K L Schmidt, *ibid.*, p 316
- 250 M Fascher, *ibid*, p 80
- 251 K.L. Schmidt - Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Neue Folge, Heft 20, 1923, p 95f.) [The Status of the Gospels in general Literature History (Research on Religion and Literature of the Old and New Testament, New Series, Book 20)]
- 252 K L Schmidt, *ibid*, p 100

- 253 A Drews - Das Markus–Evangelium, 2nd edit., 1928, p 10
- 254 A Drews, ibid, p 131
- 255 A Drews, ibid, p 8
- 256 H Raschke - Die Werkstatt des Markus–Evangelisten, 1924, p 10 [The Workshop of the Mark Evangelist]
- 257 L Feiler - Die Entstehung des Christentums aus dem Geiste des magischen Denkens, 1927, p 95 [Christianity's formation out of the Spirit of Magical Thinking]
- 258 Feiler, ibid., p 96
- 259 Feiler, ibid., p 95
- 260 Feiler, ibid., p 97
- 261 Feiler, ibid., p 98
- 262 Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, published by Bousset und Heitmüller, Vol. I, 4th, edit., 1929, p 343